THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

Dr. Paul Tournier is at one and the same time a great doctor, a great psychologist, and a great Christian. The main impression which one gets from reading his new book, *The Meaning of Persons*,[1] is that it is a searching book. To read it is to have the painful, yet salutary, experience of being compelled to look into one's own heart. Dr. Tournier's own claim is: 'What I want, in fact, is to put into a book not only my ideas, but my person.' And the author who gives himself will always write a book with an air of greatness.

There are two words which are very like each other, but which mean very different things. Every man is a *person*; and every man is a *personage*. The *person* is the essential man, the real self; the *personage* is the front with which a man confronts both the world and himself. It would be in any event difficult to come at the real person, for, as Napoleon said, 'One becomes the man of one's uniform.' Yet the problem of life is to get from the personage to the person.

We begin with the simple fact that every man is in fact a contradictory being. There is the politician, who is used to confronting great crowds and to swaying them with his eloquence, but who confesses that he has refused an invitation to tea with a friend, lest his hand would shake, and so betray his timidity. There is the undistinguished civil servant who behind the miserable façade is a real artist, with the productions of his art hidden away in a drawer for none to see. There is the devoutly religious man who lays bare to the doctor 'the intolerable tragedy of his life: he is generally thought of as an example of serene piety, whereas in reality he is haunted constantly by sexual obsessions.' Every man is a contradiction.

How, then, can we penetrate behind the contradictions? There is the way of introspective self-examination. But even with the greatest possible sincerity that way is doomed to failure. 'I am thirty-six,' writes André Gide, 'and I do not know yet whether I am miserly or prodigal, sober or gluttonous.' Paul Claudel writes: 'Merely by looking at ourselves we falsify ourselves.' Amiel, who sought earnestly for the truth about himself, and who thought intensely about himself, ends by saying: 'He (the thinker) depersonalizes himself.' Nietzsche says: 'Every one is furthest from himself.' Professor Gusdorf is driven to the conclusion: 'It seems to me sincerity is an unattainable ideal.' Even if complete sincerity were possible, the result is defeat. Shri Ramakrishna writes: 'Think well, and you will see that there is nothing you can call "I."' As you peel an onion, there is always another layer, but you never reach the kernel. So when you analyse the ego, it disappears completely.'

Can you, then, reach beyond the personage to the person by treating a man as a thing, and analysing him as you would a thing? Again, defeat lies that way. There remains something which eludes. You can analyse the instruments of an orchestra, but they are controlled by a conductor. You can analyse a man, but somewhere there is a conducting self; and, in any event, we no sooner embark on such an analysis than we meet the primary mystery of consciousness itself.

The way to discover self is to realize that life is essentially a dialogue. 'The whole difference between an individual and a person is that the individual associates, while the person communicates.' 'Man is a person,' writes Professor Seifert, 'inasmuch as he can speak, and inasmuch as one can speak to him and with him.' That is why Sartre writes: 'I cannot know myself except through the intermediary of another person.' But it is just here that we come up against the great obstacle. It is characteristic of man that he does not wish to reveal himself to other persons. The words of the fable say: 'In order to live happy, live hidden.' One of Dr. Tournier's patients said to him: 'Life is a universal game of hide-and-seek in which we just pretend to hide.' Jean de Rougemont has it: 'Man seeks man and flees

[1] S.C.M.; 21s. net.

from him.' The whole technique of life can lie in concealing oneself in small talk, in timidity, in work, in haste, in a jest when the conversation is threatening to become embarrassingly intimate.

But not only is life a dialogue with man, if the person is to be found; it is also a dialogue with God. God is always speaking to man, even though man may not realize it: 'faith consists only in realizing who it is who speaks.' 'No one,' says François Mauriac, 'can look at himself, except down on his knees in the sight of God.' Dr. TOURNIER finely says: 'The Bible might be called the story of the dialogue interrupted and the dialogue re-established.' Jesus Christ is the dialogue re-established, for He is 'God coming to us because we cannot go to Him.'

Here, then, we come to the very centre of the whole matter. If life is dialogue in which a man must give all of himself, then life must be *commitment*; and it must be commitment of self. That commitment demands a sense of personal responsibility. We often do what we call 'our duty' to some other person in some kind of need, by giving him some kind of material aid, and then we think that our responsibility is ended. But to find the person in ourselves and in others, commitment of ourselves is necessary. And then there emerges the second great truth; commitment involves *choice*; and only in Jesus Christ can this choice be made.

Dr. TOURNIER'S close-wrought book defies adequate summary. It is a book which a man should read, not only because it is a book of absorbing interest, but also for the good of his own soul. And, finally, we must note that the translation of Mr. Edwin Hudson is such a triumph of translation that one would never know that it was a translation.

To bring forth from his treasure things new and old is the part of the Christian scribe; and to see him do it is a stimulus and a delight to the reverent observer. It is indeed astonishing how passages of Scripture which have been commented on and preached on throughout the centuries can still be made to yield up fresh insights under the quickening of the Holy Spirit.

These reflections were evoked by reading a few chapters of a devotional work recently published —*Into the Same Image*, by the Rev. Reginald E. O. White, M.A., B.D.[1] It expounds the Christian ideal of Christlikeness and challenges Christians to abandon a mean contentment with shallow experience and limited attainment and to reach out to the highest levels of saintliness and service, and in so doing it attempts to sketch a fresh portrait of our Lord, so that the believer may realize afresh, or it may be for the first time, the image into which he is being changed. We choose four instances where, as it seems to us, the author gives us something both old and new, something potentially fruitful both for intellectual enlightenment and for spiritual enrichment.

[1] Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 12s. 6d. net.

That all the words of Jesus recorded in the Gospels are not to be interpreted as solemn dogmatic pronouncements has long been recognised, as also has been the existence in His speech of an element of playful humour based, as humour so often is, on a keen sense of the incongruous. The Pharisee straining out the microscopic insect and swallowing the unwieldy mass of a full-grown camel: the officious neighbour rendering first-aid to a friend suffering from a speck of dust beneath his eyelid, all unconscious of the plank of wood in his own eye—surely it is only familiarity and a feeling that Scripture must be solemn that hinders the humorous incongruity from striking every reader, as no doubt it struck the original hearers. Our author, however, finds the Master's playful sallies in other passages. The concluding sentence of the discourse about taking no thought for the morrow seems to have a faithless, almost cynical, sound if taken seriously; but perhaps He said it with a flash and a smile—'After all, haven't you got enough of trouble to-day to worry about, without adding to-morrow's?' What, too, of that word to Martha which has often been made the basis of ponderous superstructures about the practical and the contemplative aspects of religion? May it not simply have been a genial and smiling hint to Martha that her housewifely zeal for making a good show of hospitality had betrayed her into criticism of her sister's truer sense of values—'Only one course is necessary, Martha, and Mary has chosen her plateful—don't let us snatch it from her'?

Again, it has often been noticed that both in the way in which He performed His miracles and in the compassion which prompted them Jesus showed a superb understanding and tender considerateness. Our author attempts to apply this insight to the rather difficult account of the raising of Jairus' daughter. The thoughtfulness behind the command to give her food is obvious, but it is not clear how the words 'She is not dead, but sleepeth' are to be taken. Was their ambiguity perhaps deliberate? And what was the point of charging those present to keep the matter

secret when the whole district must have got to know at once ? Our author covers both questions with the suggestion that Jesus spoke and acted as He did simply in order that the girl might not know she had been dead, but might return to normal life, knowing only that she had been very ill and that the Prophet had come and wakened her, and that, though many people thought she had died, it was really only the last deep sleep that made her better. As for the neighbours, they might think what they would : His concern was with the inner feelings and needs of those He was helping. For their sake He wanted to minimise the exciting, startling, numinous side of the incident.

Yet, again, the charge that Jesus was mad may be taken simply as a malicious sneer ; but one may well see more in it than that, especially since in its Marcan context it is associated with the charge of being in league with, or under the possession of, the prince of the devils. These charges seem so absurd as to be unworthy of notice ; but that may be because we fail to allow for the ancient belief that insanity was in fact a form of possession, whether by Divine or demonic powers. Were these charges rendered plausible by the fact that in Jesus there was quite evidently something not of this world—an awareness, a standard of values, a serenity, and yet an energy and a mastery that spoke of another and more mysterious realm than this ?

In a recent religious film, entitled ' The Supreme Secret,' there is a moving and yet partly humorous episode where a gangster lad, fleeing from the police, finds refuge in the local Mission Hall, and, for his own safety, is forced to sit and listen while an old shopkeeper, whose shop has been broken into by the gang, gives his personal testimony to the love of God and the power of prayer. Subsequently the lad and the old man exchange a few words, and the impression of the latter on the former finds expression later in the perfectly sincere exclamation, ' He's crackers—barmy.' Is this perhaps a part of true Christlikeness that we like to forget ? To follow Him means to keep in step with a distant drum, whose beat our neighbours cannot hear. That must sometimes mean that to them we are odd, eccentric, abnormal people who face the tasks and responsibilities of this world as those who belong elsewhere and are on the march to distant horizons. Did not our Lord speak of His people being in the world, but not of it ? Did not His apostle remind us that our citizenship is in heaven ?

Finally, dealing with the objection, so discouraging to the young Christian, that ' Christianity is fine, but impracticable,' our author asks the question whether there is any reason to think that Jesus was the victim of wishful thinking and unreal sentimentalism about life and people. Part of His reply is to look carefully at some of the people described in the Gospels with devastating realism—religious leaders, political figures, His own wayward followers, and also the churlish neighbour, the avaricious farmer with no thought for anything but crops and barns, the ruthless moneylender, the inconsistent debtor, glad to be forgiven but relentless toward those in his power, the jealous farmer sowing tares in his neighbour's corn for spite, the domineering foreman, starving and beating the servants in his charge, the rascally steward, falsifying accounts to conceal his thieving —some thirty characters, all unattractive, some repellent, each helping to set the tone of a deplorable communal life. Clearly our Lord had no need of modern psychology to tell Him the evil things that come from within and defile both man and society.

From this two important considerations follow. The first is that Christlikeness demands heroes. That being the kind of world He saw, it is no wonder that He told His followers that He was sending them out as sheep amidst wolves. They would indeed, He assured them, have much joy ; but they would get into constant trouble and must be prepared for a criminal's death. The second thing—so reassuring to the Christian believer—is that He never had a shadow of doubt that ultimate victory would be His and theirs, for with God all things are possible. Christianity, in short, is an optimism that emerges from a pessimism, or, as our author puts it, ' It is this undismayed optimism that is the true counterpart to the realism of Jesus, and that makes His whole outlook so unintelligible to the man of no faith—to all who see only the facts of life, and see not God.'

Devotional and Pastoral Classics

Oman's 'Concerning the Ministry': A Revaluation

By the Very Reverend George Johnstone Jeffrey, D.D., Glasgow

Many of us will recall our quiet thrill of pleasure on first reading this stimulating book. It appeared in 1936 when men were still trying to garner the hard-won lessons of the First War, little knowing that in three years' time the Nazi cauldron would boil over in a second global catastrophe. Such is the setting of a volume that can still be read with profit and enlightenment. For one thing there is nothing stereotyped in its style or contents. The writer modestly describes it as 'just talks' with freedom to wander into bypaths, adding that it deals only with the human side of the ministry, especially life and men and books. The mere mention of some of the chapter-headings should whet the appetite of any man in the ministry who refuses to become blasé or cynical regarding his vocation—'The Choice of Ways,' 'A Prophet to the People,' 'Enemies of Leisure [Flurry and Worry],' 'Personal Weight,' 'Changing Mood and Life's Variety,' 'Style and Matter.' The reading of this book may be compared to the joy we had now and then in one's early ministry of spending a long, leisurely evening in the congenial company of a minister of rich experience—scholarly, wise, humorous, deeply spiritual—ourselves emerging from the interview with the conviction that the ministry is a calling, difficult indeed but not desperate, and certainly not to be exchanged for any other in the world.

This is not a book to read at a sitting. Truth to tell it sags here and there and becomes ponderous. It should be read slowly, 'savoured' and brooded upon. If it is thus read, the man must be strangely made who does not lay it down with his whole nature refreshed and above all with his motives purified—able to give a continuous and sincere affirmative to the question put to him in the holy moment of ordination—'Are not zeal for the glory of God, love to Jesus Christ and a desire of saving souls your great motives and chief inducements to enter the office of the Holy Ministry?'

Oman brings his antiseptic humour to bear on some of the subtle temptations of our calling, such as egotism and self-pity. His ideal for our inner life seems to be that we should take our work with the utmost seriousness *without boring others with our seriousness.* After all there are other men in the ministry. He girds gaily at the spirit which confuses fussy overbusyness with spiritual achievement. 'Once you esteem yourselves phenomenally busy men there is the possibility some day of taking the fluttering of the washing on the clothes-line of self-importance for eagle's wings soaring in the empyrean.' He repeatedly warns us of the perils of self-pity, quoting with approval the words of James Chalmers, the missionary: 'Don't send us fellows who talk of self-sacrifice. Send us those who take danger and difficulties as the pepper and salt of life.' He is surgical also with those who flirt with popularity, which 'eateth like a canker' at a man's sense of God. While allowing for the place of gratitude from those whom our preaching may have helped. he would have agreed with Gladstone's dictum 'Praise is a passing breeze to be enjoyed but not detained.' Frankly we have known a few ministers who have so long lapped up adulation that it is difficult to say a sincere word of thanks to them lest we incur the censure of George Herbert's austere words—'Feed no man on his sins.'

But one would be giving a totally wrong impression of this wise and gracious book if one described its tone as merely carping or negative. Here and there one may feel that the writer is speaking from the comparative immunity of a Professor's Chair to men daily facing the clash and barrage of varying temperaments. Possibly this explains the rather fierce saying by an elderly minister which he quotes: 'Handling a congregation is like handling dogs. They never bite you till they see you are frightened.' I prefer his quotation from Disraeli—'*Never complain and never explain*'—a valuable working rule in the ministry. True, it is a counsel of perfection and we may never attain to it but we can 'follow after.'

Perhaps what one chiefly admires in this book is its fine sense of balance and proportion. In reading it, a counsel of W. M. Macgregor's comes back to mind—the importance of '*correcting one's bias.*' Our very preoccupation with our own moods may make us unhealthily introspective. He closes an admirable chapter on 'Changing Mood and

Life's Variety' with these weighty words: 'To this end we ought to pray: "Give us freedom, give us quietness, give us expansiveness." But this is all summed up in "Give us a heart at leisure from itself," which can only be assured by the peace which the world cannot give or take away, because we have committed our immortal as well as our mortal welfare into wise and stronger hands than our own, and are anxious for nothing, *not even our own souls*.'

In a valuable chapter on 'Pulpit Delivery' Oman urges on us the same lesson of balance and proportion. He seems to believe that one of the commonest faults in preaching arises from a man's very fervour. Thus a preacher is tempted to turn on this fiery earnestness full blast from the opening sentence and try to sustain this to the end, the result being an irritating *monotony of seriousness* which defeats its own purpose.

> Out it streams, this panting diction
> Carries all things save conviction.

He has useful advice also on what might be called monotony of temperament. 'A person with a smile glued on his face and hilariousness always ringing in his voice is only a little less trying than the knight of the rueful countenance and gloomy utterance.' One is glad to think that Oman is not above quoting the old tag which some of us hold has never been bettered—

> Begin low, speak slow,
> Rise higher, catch fire,
> Wax warm, sit down in a storm.

He is at his best in the many things he has to say on a man's search for truth, a quest to which every minister is conscript. He warns us that truth is not captured by brutal assault or by the hair of the head but comes after long patience and much tolerance, above all by 'doing the will.' 'Seeking finality in religion,' he says, 'is trying to walk on the sky, and expecting it in earthly things is denying that the sky exists.' He has many humorously intriguing things to say on the matter of preaching. He has little use for the preacher who mistakes for originality the habit of being for ever on the search for *outré* texts. The best ends in the ministry of the word 'will not be served by forcing meaning on the words or selecting phrases torn from their contexts.' He relates the story of Bishop Wilberforce and the curate—'"What have you been preaching on?" "On 'Hear the church.'" "But there is no such text in the Bible." "Surely, my Lord, 'if any man will not hear the church.'" "Well, I will give you another for Sunday. 'Hang all the law and the prophets.'"'

Oman shows the same sense of balance when he speaks of the rival claims of the study and the street. There are ministers who cannot sit at their desk, just as there are those who cannot sit comfortably anywhere else. The former have carried to excess the bluff, back-slapping, hail-fellow-well-met attitude to their folks. This may go down with the unthinking who consider that being a good mixer should be a successful minister's priority. Fervid bookman though he was, Oman dips the scale in favour of the minister who has a sincere and well-informed interest in a member's daily concerns—his work, his home, his hobbies, his temperament. Many a man who sits lightly to the Church may be won to a warmer allegiance, if he can talk with pleasure and profit with his minister on what after all makes up seven-tenths of his working life. An incident from Boswell is in place here. 'A clergyman was complaining of want of society in the country where he lived and said "They talk of runts (that is young cows)." "Sir," said Mrs. Salusbury, "Mr. Johnson would learn to talk of runts."' Here if anywhere is a hint to the minister who prides himself on having no 'small talk,' to the impoverishment of his preaching and personality.

It is a complement to all this to note that Oman implies that we must honour our people by giving them credit for understanding the deepest themes of our faith. He insists on the necessity of doctrinal preaching that can still be warm and human. I remember preaching a sermon on the Holy Spirit and a plain working woman coming to the vestry in grateful mood saying, 'I wish you ministers would give us ordinary folks credit for a little mysticism.' Burdened with the worries of business, the cares of home, and the plague of their own hearts, every honest hearer knows that his supreme need is the need of God who has made us for more than eating and drinking and getting and spending and has set eternity in our heart. All the more need for the preacher to combat the cursory and superficial thinking of many to-day—a temper of mind that has been described as 'the sharp, shallow, inconsecutive modern intellect which prefers the article to the book, the paragraph to the article and eventually the headline to the paragraph.' All through his book Oman insists on the preacher sharing with his people the best of his hard-won knowledge and the deepest things in the Christian faith.

Here our study of a most appealing and rewarding book must end. What has been described has naturally been selective. Enough if such a selection sends even a few interested ministers back to its pages. Here is a constant challenge to austere thought, to the habitude of prayer, to a deeper interest in our fellow-men and, above all, to a closer walk with God.

Literature

THE REALITY OF FAITH

In a series entitled 'World Perspectives' Messrs Allen and Unwin have published a new book by Professor Paul Tillich with the title *Dynamics of Faith* (9s. 6d. net). The word 'faith' has been peculiarly subject to misunderstandings, distortions and questionable definitions; as Dr Tillich himself puts it, the word 'needs healing before it can be used for the healing of men.' This is what he attempts to do in this book; or at least to offer an interpretation of the term 'faith' so as to remove from it 'confusing and distorting connotations.'

The first two chapters study faith as man's experience of being grasped by the infinite. Into this concern with the infinite, the unconditioned, the whole self enters. We cannot therefore do justice to faith if we assess it in terms of a particular segment of life (mind, or will, or emotion). The objective side of faith, the *fides quae creditur*, is the theme of chs. 3 and 4. That to which the act of faith is directed, God or the Ultimate, is expressed in the symbols of religious language, and every type of religion—the main types being the ontological and the moral—requires to use them. Symbols point beyond themselves and only they can serve us religiously, that is to say, only so can we do justice to ultimacy in the divine. At this point and level of Dr Tillich's analysis the question of the truth of faith presents itself and it forms the theme of ch. 5. We cannot, says Dr Tillich, rest the truth of faith upon any other kind of truth. Faith is its own guarantee if it expresses an ultimate concern. The test however whether it is truly such a concern is given by scrutiny of the symbols. The symbol must be *alive*, by which Dr Tillich means it must drive to commitment, action, witness; and, again, it must truly avow the ultimate as ultimate. When we apply this to Christianity we can claim that in contrast to all other religions it expresses itself in the most adequate symbol, the Cross of Christ. This sacrifice is utter homage to the Divine, it defends the faith from idolatry, it is fertile towards activity that unites in itself courage and humility. This latter emphasis is explicated further and finely in the concluding chapter on 'The Life of Faith.'

We have given above only a bare outline of an arresting and a rich book. It is written in a remarkably clear style, and not infrequently the presentation becomes moving eloquence. For any reader wishing a way of approach to the larger study of these topics in Dr Tillich's other books we can recommend this little book as a most useful guide. For the critical reader the arguments presented here will raise not a few difficulties. The great emphasis on the ontological, on the term 'Being' as the only non-symbolic way of speaking of God, and upon the negativity that clings to all finitude will prompt him to ask whether there can be on such a basis a historical core in Christianity that is literally crucial. If, as Dr. Tillich agrees, the symbol participates in that to which it points, will not the Cross in the faith of the Christian be the ultimate concern in a more positive encounter than a safeguard against idolatry? At this point the ontology in the analysis appears to us to come short in elucidating quality. But the final word of this review must be grateful thanks to the author for his learned and moving treatment of 'the central phenomenon in man's personal life.' It is a pleasure to acknowledge also the attractive format the publishers have given to the book.

J. Macleod

A COMMENTARY ON MARK XIII

A Commentary on a single chapter is probably without a parallel, but this is precisely what Dr. G. R. Beasley-Murray, M.A., M.Th., has written under the title, *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen* (Macmillan; 18s. net). The explanation for this is not only the importance of the chapter, but the fact that in 'Jesus and the Future' the author has previously written a substantial work on the history of the criticism of Mk 13 and its theology, and that several of his senior colleagues have intimated to him their desire to see an exposition of the discourse based on the research embodied in the earlier volume. This exposition has now been supplied. The commentary proper is preceded by a short introduction in which Dr. Beasley-Murray discusses the authenticity of Mk 13. He summarizes the arguments of T. Colani, who held the chapter to be unauthentic and replies to them in detail. In particular, he examines and rejects Colani's submission that the Discourse reflects the outlook of the Jewish Christian Church, not that of the historical Jesus. This view, he maintains, is the fruit of a radical criticism of the Gospels and no little misunderstanding of what they actually teach. 'Mk. xiii. 28–29, 32 taken together suffice to show that our Lord taught his disciples to have

regard for signs of the End, the date of which is unknowable.' As against the contention of C. H. Dodd and other interpreters he holds that the Parable of the Fig Tree (Mk $13^{28f.}$) relates to a situation lying in the future and preceded by signs which intimate its certain approach. These points and many others are discussed in great detail in the commentary, with many references to contemporary discussions and abundant illustrations from the Old Testament and the Rabbinical writings. In the course of the commentary there is a long and valuable note on the history of the interpretation of the phrase usually translated 'the Abomination of Desolation.' Dr. Beasley-Murray prefers the rendering 'The Appalling Abomination' or 'The Abomination that causes horror' and takes the view that it implies, not the destruction of the Temple, but its desecration by the armies of Rome. 'Let him that readeth understand' is probably a parenthesis of the Evangelist, either drawing attention to the fresh and significant application of the Danielic phrase or appealing to the reader to look beneath the surface.

It is impossible in this review to mention more than a few of the arresting thoughts and discussions in which the Commentary abounds. In general, the attitude taken is that of a scholarly conservatism, but Dr. Beasley-Murray takes the opportunity to disclaim the view that 'Jesus and the Future' was written to prove that Mk 13 was spoken by Jesus precisely in the form in which it has come down to us. What he wrote was intended to show that the contents of the discourse have a high claim to authenticity, which, as he says, is a different matter. Even so, it may well be that the author claims too much, and does not sufficiently allow for the apocalyptic veil through which the teaching of Jesus is seen. The opinion that Lk 21^{20-24} and other passages in the Lukan discourse are simply a re-writing of Mark, or even a paraphrase, appears to be too readily accepted, and reads rather oddly in the light of the high claims made for the Markan text. Such criticisms, however, are not meant to be hostile. We are only too grateful to Dr. Beasley-Murray who bids us on many points to think again.

VINCENT TAYLOR

COMPARATIVE RELIGION

This latest addition to 'World Perspectives' books—*Mysticism: Christian and Buddhist*, by D. T. Suzuki (Allen and Unwin; 13s. 6d. net)—is true to the type of the series, the sponsors of which are generally influenced by impatience over the exclusive or 'colonial' attitude of Christians of rigidly orthodox schools. Lamentations over recent expansion of Buddhism in certain regions of the East are regarded, especially by those who are, understandably, unable to divest themselves of nationalistic spirit, as ungracious if not hostile to other faiths.

The keynote of this book of Mr. Suzuki, who has achieved an outstanding reputation as an authority on the subject of interrelations of different religions, is that we should look for agreements rather than differences; and he here strengthens his position by an interesting and, on the whole, fair-minded study of the similarities between Meister Eckhart's teaching and Buddhism, chiefly that form of it known in the Far East as Zen Buddhism.

The author (now associated with Columbia University) is rather obsessed by the idea of identity between Eckhart and Zen Buddhism, but hardly gets farther than the establishment of similarity—which is by no means the same. He justifiably, however, finds Eckhart agreeing with the Buddhists that intellectual procedure alone is not the way towards the fullest spiritual experience, and in this attitude mystics of all ages and all countries would concur. He is on the whole sympathetic towards Christianity, but occasionally displays a certain bias, particularly in the chapter on 'Crucifixion and Enlightenment'—otherwise an excellent piece of writing. The figure of the Crucified Christ widens for him the gap between Christianity and Buddhism, and he traces concentration on suffering and death to 'a sadistic impulse of the psychically affected brain,' and, again, 'A Resurrection is dramatic and human enough, but there is still the odour of the body in it.' Such statements do not help forward his avowed aim of reconciliation, to which he is usually faithful. He helps most of all towards mutual understanding by the convincingness of his argument that the Buddhist *Nirvana* is not wholly negative, but is an assertion of primal Being, the source from which all things come, although he admits that our linguistically restricted conceptualism (suitable only to the relative world) cannot reach the adjustment of Nothingness and Fulness of Being, or the harmonising of Time and Eternity. Yet in such conjunction, he thinks, is to be found the Godhead in which all mystics believe, although the Buddhist may refuse the name of 'God' to his Ultimate Reality. Mr. Suzuki also vehemently rejects the accusation of a-moralism often brought against Buddhism, but he is hardly so successful in this as in his other main contention. This is a most useful book which should be in the hands of all students of Comparative Religion, not forgetting the sponsors of the series to which it belongs.

W. S. URQUHART

There are few subjects which have raised such wide interest as the approach to the New Testament which is commonly known as demythologizing. In *Christology and Myth in the New Testament* the Rev. Geraint Vaughan Jones has given us, to use his own sub-title, ' An Inquiry into the Character, Extent and Interpretation of the Mythological Element in New Testament Christology ' (Allen and Unwin ; 21s. net).

It is safe to say that this is a book of massive learning. Seldom can any writer have had such an inclusive knowledge of the literature of his subject. An indication of this is that in the index of names the names of almost one hundred and seventy writers are cited. The obvious danger into which such a book will run is that it may become a mere compilation of other men's opinions. But to his erudition Mr. Jones adds judgment of the most penetrating kind.

There is no book in English which more fairly and fully sets out and documents Bultmann's position. It is impossible to do justice to so weighty a volume in a short review. But we thoroughly agree with Mr. Jones when he argues that Christianity can never be set out in baldly propositional form ; and we thoroughly agree with him that the New Testament expressions of it must be regarded as what might be called poetical expressions of truth which is unsayable in ordinary terminology.

This is not an easy book to read, but we are quite sure that for the New Testament scholar it is a necessary book to read, and that it will become in time a standard work on its subject.

On p. 86 ἐκενόσεν should be ἐκένωσεν.

Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy, by Franz Alexander, M.D. (Allen and Unwin ; 25s. net), is a book for the expert, and for those interested in the tendency to deviationism among psychoanalysts. Dr. Alexander is one of the oldest followers of Freud. His deviation is along the line of treatment. He is anxious that psychoanalysis should now give up its isolation from orthodox psychiatry, psychotherapy and become linked with the medical schools. Treatment must be shortened, and he thinks this can be done by what he calls ' psycho-analytically oriented psychotherapy.' Apart from this controversial issue, the volume shows a brilliant insight into the processes of cure, and emphasises the need for the analyst to take account of the ' counter-transference,' *i.e.*, the influence of analyst upon the patient.

The Holy Pretence, by Professor George L. Mosse of Wisconsin (Blackwell ; 21s. net), derives its title from a sentence in a manuscript in the British Museum, ' If People are unreasonable, then must the Prince bow for a time and little by little bring them to his purpose by some craft or by some holy pretence.' The book is a study of the relationship between Christianity and Reason of State, as it is presented in some of the English Puritan casuists. What is the Christian attitude to Machiavellian policy and Reason of State ? How is the good man to survive in an evil world ? How is the balance between serpent and dove to be maintained ? Here is fresh light upon an aspect of the assimilation of the Renaissance by the Reformation and upon a Puritanism that was attuned to political action and ready to use prudence of a realistic kind in building up and defending the godly society.

A Roman Catholic scholar, Xavier Léon-Dufour, S.J., Professor of Exegesis in the Theological Faculty of Enghien, Belgium, has issued a *Concordance of the Synoptic Gospels in Seven Colours* (Desclée, Tournai, Belgium). The idea, of course, is not new. Half-a-century ago we had the Polychrome Bible. In 1938 Messrs. T. and T. Clark published Professor Allan Barr's ' A Diagram of Synoptic Relationships ' which proved so useful to students that it was reprinted in 1949. We do not know whether Professor Léon-Dufour has seen this previous work. At all events the two diagrams differ considerably. Both scholars give an explanation of the Synoptic problem. The one now before us makes no mention of the Q document of which Protestant scholars make so much. While Barr put it all ingeniously in one diagram the present production gives us three separate diagrams, one for each of the three Gospels. That has meant a great deal of extra work for the author, duplication being inevitable ; but it has advantages for the student, who can at once find the parallels to the particular passage he is studying in any of the three Gospels. While Barr used only four colours, this scholar uses seven. This makes at first sight for some bewilderment. But as the author suggests the colour-scheme and various signs are easily memorized, and by trying a few verses one soon gets a grip of the plan. What pleases us most is this practical demonstration of the freedom allowed to Roman Catholic scholarship which the Papal ban on ' Modernism ' at the opening of the century seemed to have fettered.

The *Concordance* has been felicitously translated from French into English by R. J. O'Connell, S.J.

We welcome a little book that is both scholarly and popular—*Why I am a Protestant*, by the Rev. Rupert E. Davies of Didsbury College, Bristol (Epworth Press ; 7s. 6d. net). The book is in two parts. In the first the writer sets out his

reasons for being a Protestant, and in the second his reasons for rejecting the Roman Catholic alternative. The basic error of the latter he finds in the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church and of the Pope in particular. This is a book to put into the hands of Protestants who wish to be surer of their position, and especially of young people who may be attracted by some features of Roman Catholic practice. The argument is fair and courteous.

The Beckly Social Service Lecture for 1957 has been published as *God's Business*, by the Rev. Edward Rogers (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net). It is an acute and well-informed Study in the Relationship between Economics and Theology. These two disciplines most clearly overlap in the field of personal relationships; but the author finds other themes demanding consideration.

We commend especially the chapters on Communist Economics, Work and Automation. Our only complaint is that the author is much too respectful to our unjust money system, of which he truly remarks, 'Long-term working with it is like building a house with nine-inch bricks that slowly shrink to four inches but are still called nine-inch bricks.'

The Preacher's Handbook, No. 5, edited by the Rev. Greville P. Lewis, B.A., B.D. (Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net), will need little commendation to those who have used any of the earlier four issues. It is in three parts—Introductory Articles, Study Articles and Commentaries for Preachers on Is 40–55 and on Jn 1–4. Space forbids mention of several distinguished contributors and useful articles. We content ourselves with affirming that it is not the Local Preachers of Methodism only who would benefit from a thorough reading of this rich and varied book. The next number is expected in 1959.

In 1956 the Leicester Diocesan Evangelistic Council asked Canon Albert William Eaton, Vicar of St. Peter's, Leicester, to prepare and direct a course of instruction by correspondence for those who wanted to know what membership in the Church of England implied. Within a few weeks hundreds of people were enrolled in the course; and the material of it is now published as *The Faith, History and Practice of the Church of England* (Hodder and Stoughton; 4s. 6d. net). The third section of the book, an exposition of the Book of Common Prayer as a scheme for the practice of the faith from birth to death, is especially valuable. We trust this book will be widely used.

The Hungarian Reformed Church has had a heroic and colourful history and its constitution, fundamentally Presbyterian, includes the kind of bishop that Calvin sketched in a letter to the King of Poland. In both these respects it ought to be of special interest to churchmen of the Reformed tradition everywhere to-day. Hence we welcome the only modern attempt to tell the story in English—*History of the Hungarian Reformed Church*, by Dr. Imre Revesz, tr. by Professor G. A. F. Knight of Knox College, Dunedin, formerly minister in charge of the Church of Scotland's Jewish Mission in Budapest. This valuable book was published last year by the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, 1801 'P' Street, N.W., Washington 6. The price is not stated.

After a long life of service in the Church of England and much study of the Scriptures the Rev. G. R. Harding Wood, M.A., has produced *A Bird's-Eye View of the Bible*, vol. 1: *Old Testament* (Marshall, Morgan and Scott; 10s. 6d. net). It gives an analysis of each book in turn, although the author admits that in some cases, such as Proverbs, Psalms or Hosea, it is almost impossible to classify the contents. Many remarks are pointed and helpful. His general view of the Old Testament, however, is one long since superseded even in the minds of youth, whom apparently he has chiefly in view. He answers none of the questions which modern youth asks, and imparts some information which many know to be erroneous, as when he says that from the first the Jews accepted 'Esther' as canonical.

'World Church' takes on new meaning when a theological text-book, first published in Tamil for village workers in South India, comes to grace the book shelves of the West. *Lux ex Oriente* indeed! Bishop Lesslie Newbigin has rightly won a high place in the regard of the Christian world. Many will think this study of *Sin and Salvation* (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net) to be one of the best things he has done. It shows marks of its origin in the clarity of its thought and the simplicity of its language. This in no way detracts from, but rather enhances, its importance as a contribution to doctrine. The bare bones of a simple outline, expanded in detail on the contents page, are clothed with solid exposition of Scripture as it has come alive to one working on the frontier of the Church. He is not concerned to state and endorse or criticize the views of other scholars, but to set out man's great need and what God in Christ has done to meet it. That he has succeeded in his task all who read the book will agree.

Anglican-Presbyterian Relations

By the Right Reverend A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D., the Bishop of Derby

The recently published Joint Report on *Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches* has been described by the Archbishop of Canterbury as setting 'a new standard for inter-Church discussion,' and as being destined to be 'known as a landmark in the work of Church union.' A Presbyterian divine remarked recently that 'when the fire had died out in the heather, and when the blood was off the claymore,' the Report might be expected to bear lasting fruit. The Churches on both sides of the Border have wisely contented themselves for the present with the reception of the Report [1] and the commendation of it for study. We who produced the Report were not asking, in the first instance, for more than this. Not until the rank and file of the membership of the four Churches immediately involved has spent some considerable time in thought, study and prayer, will the time be ripe for the taking of definite decisions: and when the decisions at last are taken, it is to be hoped that those who take them may be at the same time humble and penitent, irenic and realistic.

There had been earlier discussions between representatives of the Churches of England and of Scotland—that is, between two 'established' or 'national' Churches; and the representatives of the Episcopal Church in Scotland and of the Presbyterian Church of England taking part in these earlier discussions had been present only as 'observers.' The facts that, in respect of the Conversations of which the Report is now published, (1) the initiative on the Anglican side was no longer that of the Archbishop of Canterbury, acting in virtue of his office but without any particular 'mandate' from the Church, but had been assumed by the Convocations of Canterbury and York, whose members requested His Grace to take action; and (2) that nominees of the Episcopal Church in Scotland and of the Presbyterian Church of England this time took part on equal terms with their brethren and as persons accredited by their respective Churches to do so, brought it about that, in the Report which has just been published, the conferring delegates consider (as the Archbishop of Canterbury expresses it) 'not the relations between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, but the more fundamental and fruitful subject of the relations between the Episcopalian and Presbyterian systems of Church order.'

Theological disputes between the upholders of Presbyterianism and the champions of Episcopacy go back far into history. Professor Norman Sykes in his recently published *Old Priest and New Presbyter* makes it clear that the Presbyterians were first in the field in claiming that their system was alone consonant with the teaching of Holy Scripture, and that Episcopacy ought to be everywhere abolished. In England in the time of Queen Elizabeth I the Presbyterian position was stoutly maintained by the formidable controversialist Thomas Cartwright, who held the Lady Margaret Chair of Divinity at Cambridge, and who argued for a Presbyterian 'parity of ministers.' The champions of Anglicanism in this period were content to draw a distinction between matters of faith, with respect to which orthodoxy was indispensable, and questions of 'ceremonies, order, and the kind of Church government,' [2] with respect to which there was 'no one certain and perfect kind of government prescribed and commanded in the Scriptures to the Church of Christ.' [3] In England the 'godly prince,' who, as Sykes points out, had 'captured the imagination of the sixteenth-century Reformers as the "*shaliach*" has done that of some contemporary exegetes,' [4] had prescribed Episcopacy, and the Anglican reformers were 'at pains to restore the godly bishop, in contradistinction to the corrupt prelacy of the later Middle Ages, against which they had revolted.' [5]

The Anglican contention at this time was, in short, that since there was no one particular form of Church government specifically enjoined in the Scriptures (the Presbyterians were in error in supposing that the Scriptures enjoined Presbyterianism), the reformed Episcopal system, as it existed in England under the aegis of the 'godly prince,' was a form of Church government which was *lawful* for Christians, and which was not contrary to God's Word. Later Anglican schools made a more positive claim for Episcopacy, holding that it exists in the Church by Divine ordinance, and

[1] The Report on *Relations Between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches* was published simultaneously by the S.P.C.K. in London and The Saint Andrew Press in Edinburgh—prefaces being contributed respectively by the Bishop of Derby and Dr. A. C. Craig. The price of the Report is 3s. 6d. net.—Editor.

[2] Hooker, *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, III., ii. 2.

[3] Whitgift, *Works*, I., 180.

[4] Sykes, *op. cit.*, 6.

[5] Sykes, *op. cit.*, 12 ff.

that the lack of it in many Churches of the Reformation is a definite defect, only excusable (if at all) on the ground of historical circumstances and necessity.[1] A Presbyterian lay theologian, Mr. J. M. Ross, has suggested that 'it may have been the vehemence and persistence of the English Puritans' claim for the divine right of Presbytery that eventually broke the patience of the Episcopalians and led some of them to make a corresponding claim for Episcopacy.'[2]

The Church of England since the rise in 1833[3] of the Tractarian Movement has included within itself a school of thought, increasingly influential, whose valuation of Episcopacy has gone further. The High Churchmen of Caroline times and later held that Episcopacy, being of Divine ordinance, was of the *bene esse* of the Church. The newer 'Anglo-Catholic' teaching, based on the doctrine or fact of Apostolical succession, affirmed that bishops in true descent from the Episcopate of primitive times were the *indispensable* ministers of ordination, and that the sacrament of Holy Orders could *only* be bestowed by their means. Emphasis came to be laid increasingly on continuity of Orders from ordainer to ordained, and on the idea of transmission of authority in a succession going back in principle, and perhaps (as it was claimed) also in fact, to the original Apostles commissioned by Christ (cf. Jn 20^{21}). Almost all Anglicans value the fact that in England, at the time of the Reformation crisis, continuity of ordination through the Episcopate was preserved unbroken, though at the time rather as a consequence of the conservative policy of the Crown than of any insistence on the part of theologians; and the Church of England within its own borders consistently acts on the principle, inherited from pre-Reformation centuries, that a bishop is the proper minister of ordination. It is in conformity with this principle that if a minister of a non-Episcopal Church comes over to the Church of England and desires to minister therein, he must before doing so be ordained according to the Anglican rite: whereas the already ordained minister of an Episcopal Church, if he turns Anglican, is received in his existing orders and is allowed to minister in the Church of England on condition simply of an assent to Anglican formularies and of conformity to Anglican discipline.

The Tractarians and their successors have drawn inferences from this difference of requirement, and have argued that the Church of England, on a true reading of its formularies, must be held to regard ordination by bishops as, in the strictest sense, theologically necessary. It is to be noticed, however, that Article XXIII. ('of ministering in the congregation') says only that those Ministers are to be judged 'lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have publick authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard'; and that the Anglican Ordinal, though it prescribes that when deacons or priests are ordained there shall be a sermon preached declaring 'how necessary that Order is in the Church of Christ,' does not make any such prescription as to the theme or argument of the sermon to be preached on the occasion of the consecration of a bishop. Actually in the Church of England there has for centuries been a divergence of view with respect to this matter, and any attempt either to enforce the High Church view as obligatory, or on the other hand to exclude it as untenable, would inevitably have the effect of splitting the Church of England from end to end.

It is to be noted, further, that at the time of the Reformation the Church of England was given a new Ordinal, in which the late mediæval emphasis upon the idea of the offering of sacrifice as being the primary function of those ordained to the priesthood is tacitly abandoned, and the ministry of the Sacraments is set firmly in the context of the ministry of the Word. Roman Catholic controversialists on this ground deny the validity of Anglican ordinations, holding that the 'intention' of the Anglican Church in ordaining was at the Reformation fatally changed. The Anglican rejoinder is that the intention of the Church to ordain to the ministry of Word and Sacraments in accordance with the mind of Christ is in the Anglican Ordinal unquestionable, and that the Reformation change of emphasis represented merely a clearing away of mediæval accretions. The doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in the form which by the end of the mediæval period it had come to assume is not held to-day by responsible Anglican theologians, though the holding of the doctrine of Sacrifice in some more defensible form is of course normal in Anglicanism of the 'Anglo-Catholic' or 'High Church' type. Between the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as held by scholarly Anglo-Catholics to-day and the doctrine set forth by the late Professor Donald M. Baillie in the chapter headed 'The Eucharistic Offering' in his posthumous book on the Sacraments there is as little difference as makes no matter.[4]

[1] I here quote from my own pamphlet *Episcopacy and the Anglican Tradition*, published by the Church Missionary Society [1954].

[2] J. M. Ross, 'The Attitude of the Protestant Reformation to Episcopacy' (*Friends of Reunion Bulletin*, xlviii. 22).

[3] 1833 was the date of John Keble's famous Assize Sermon on National Apostasy.

[4] D. M. Baillie, *The Theology of the Sacraments* [1957], Lecture V.

From all this it seems to emerge that, as between Anglican and Presbyterian divines at the present time, there are few, if any, inevitable divergences, though of course the Presbyterians could not be expected to endorse the exclusive Tractarian view of the Episcopate. The real question at issue is whether they need go so far in their rejection of it as to refuse to be in communion, on the basis of a mutually acceptable form of Episcopal Order, with a Church in which such a view is permissible, and is in fact widely held. Those who took part on behalf of the Church of Scotland and of the Presbyterian Church of England in the recent Anglican-Presbyterian inter-Church Conversations did not think so. It was held that in the context (*a*) of the Ecumenical Movement, (*b*) of the revived interest in Biblical theology which has been a notable feature of the last few decades, and (*c*) of an atmosphere of assured friendship, a ' new approach ' had become possible. A number of important ' Biblical and doctrinal considerations concerning the Church and its ministry ' were able to be formulated in an agreed statement. The Anglicans recognized that Presbyterians certainly hold a firm, clear and positive doctrine alike of the Church and of its Ministry, and that the functions ascribed to the Ministry are under both systems in essentials the same. In neither Church is the local church, or the individual minister, left without ' oversight ' (*episcopé*). ' In the Presbyterian Churches ' (to quote the words of the *Report*) ' the ministers of the Word and Sacraments exercise a corporate episcopate, collectively through the Presbytery, along with the lay elders associated with them. . . . In the Anglican Churches there is the distinctive office of the Bishop, the essence of ' which ' lies in the coalescence of certain functions in a single person.' The Anglican representatives were however ' anxious to emphasize that the Bishop's office is rightly exercised only within the context of the corporate life of the whole Church,' at the same time admitting that this principle ' has been too often obscured in practice.' It was frankly recognized that the purely administrative functions of the Bishop's office could well be exercised through the corporate oversight of Presbytery, but the Anglicans believed that the more directly pastoral functions of *episcopé* can be better exercised by a permanent ' Father in God ' than by a Presbytery presided over by a Chairman or Moderator holding only a brief temporary office. There was further the question of the effective linking on of the local ministry with the ministry of episcopal Churches in different parts of the world which have preserved, and which highly value, continuity with the ministry of pre-Reformation times through ordination by Bishops standing in the historic episcopal succession.

It was found in the Conference that ' on the Presbyterian side there was a willingness to consider the functions of a Bishop, as they are recognized by the Anglican Communion, so long as the office was duly integrated with the Presbytery and the whole Church,' and on the Anglican side there was a corresponding willingness ' to consider the complementing and strengthening of the episcopate in Anglican Churches by ensuring the corporate functioning of *episcopé* through developments within the existing order corresponding to the sacral courts of the Church as found within the Presbyterian order.' It was suggested, in short, that the Presbyterian Churches might be prepared to consider the acceptance of the ' historic episcopate ' on the understanding that the Bishop would function strictly as a presiding ' Bishop in Presbytery,' and that the Anglican Churches on their side should be encouraged to consider the development of a form of order in which ministry and laity should be closely linked together in decisions concerned with the government and doctrine of the Church at all levels. This would mean, for example, that in the Church of England a lay element, such as already exists in the Church Assembly, should be introduced also into the Convocations of Canterbury and York in association with the existing Houses of Bishops and Clergy : and that consideration should be given to the possibility of the development in Anglican Churches of an office corresponding to that of the lay ' elder ' in Presbyterianism.

On both sides those who took part in the Conferences and who produced the Report have been greatly encouraged by the decisions taken in both England and Scotland to commend the Joint Report for study and careful consideration, in the atmosphere of prayer, by the rank and file of Church members. They have expressed, in the Report itself, their strong hope that ' at a later stage, and consequent upon such study and examination, the four Churches, if they all agree, should make together a solemn resolve to seek reconciliation and unity with one another.' At the same time it should be recognized that what is envisaged is *not* ' one single " Church of Great Britain," but rather a " Church of England " and a " Church of Scotland " in full communion with one another in the one Church of Christ.' The proposed modifications ' do not involve a uniformity of life and worship throughout these Churches, but rather the freedom of each Church under God to continue and develop in its own full inheritance of life and worship throughout its parishes and congregations. What is envisaged in these modifications is a *fullness of sacramental communion* between these two Churches, involving a fully authorized interchange of communicants and mutual recognition of ministries.' May God prosper and guide the deliberations of the four Churches concerned !

Luther as Exegete [1]

By Professor Kurt Aland, D.D., Halle-Wittenberg

The subject of Hermeneutics—the correct understanding and interpretation of Holy Scripture—occupies, at the present day, the central place in the Protestant theology of the Continent. It has been the object of a vast amount of research, involving all branches of theology—Biblical (both Old and New Testaments), systematic and practical. As the result of Rudolf Bultmann's demythologizing of the New Testament, these questions have become matters of vehement dispute and disputation, not only by theologians, but no less among the rank and file of Church membership.

Side by side with such controversial exegesis of Scripture has gone the extension of research into the history of Scriptural exegesis, not only of single, isolated passages, but of entire Biblical books—a study in which Biblical exegesis can be said historically to have held up a mirror to the thought of its age. And not only do the great Biblical exegetes reflect their own epoch in history, they have also profoundly influenced subsequent generations, sometimes even whole centuries.

This is especially true of Martin Luther. His interpretation of the Scripture has not only left its mark on the theologians and churches of the Lutheran Confession for more than four centuries, but is of no less decisive importance for all Protestant churches and denominations.

The Reformation originated in the re-discovery of Paul; and all that it reformed in theology and Church—whatever their particular development later—stems from Scriptural interpretation. Luther felt himself and his work to be founded on his oath as Doctor of Holy Scripture, and his life-work from the academic chair was exclusively exegetical. All his writings, whatever theme they treat, are simply Scriptural interpretation or its application. So it is not to be wondered at if those historians who devote themselves to the history of exegesis take a special interest in Luther.[2]

I want here to try to answer the question, What were the principles drawn up by Luther for evangelical exegesis in his time and ours? I shall not seek to do this by giving you a mosaic of isolated quotations from Luther. I shall rather try to examine in their context some of his writings, especially important for our theme, and draw my conclusions from them.

The first publication we must consider is Luther's answer to Erasmus of 1525: *De Servo Arbitrio*, for the subject of this really is, Does Scripture afford us a clear answer to the problems of faith? The problem of free will which is discussed by Luther and Erasmus is to some extent only an opportunity for debating this theme. If the problem of free will is to be decided, it must first of all be made clear whether it is possible to obtain from Scripture unambiguous statements on the central questions of faith. Erasmus took refuge in the authority of the Catholic Church, proclaiming his submission to its decisions on dogma whether he understood them or not. 'What is it that you say, Erasmus?' objects Luther.

> 'What can the Church decide that is not decided in Scripture? What new sort of piety and modesty is this, that you by your example would take from us the freedom of judging human decrees and submit yourself, by surrendering your own judgment, to mere man? Where does God's Scripture order that? The Christian is cursed indeed who is not sure and does not comprehend what is laid down for him (by the Church). For how shall he believe what he does not understand?' (Weimarer Ausgabe, xviii. 604 f.)

The Christian not only may, he *must* account to himself for what the Church requires him to believe. For that his basis is the Scriptures.

In order to justify his point of view Erasmus had referred to two Scripture passages, Ro 11^{33}: 'O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways are past finding out!' and Is 40^{13}: 'Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counsellor hath taught him?' Luther objects that God and the Scriptures, like Creator and Creation, are two different things. 'That in God much that we know not is hidden,

[1] A lecture delivered at the St. Andrews School of Theology, 2nd July, 1957.

[2] Significant German works on this subject are: *Evangelische Evangelienauslegung: Eine Untersuchung zu Luthers Hermeneutik*, by Gerhard Ebeling [Münich, 1942]; *Luther und das Alte Testament*, by Heinrich Bornkamm [Tübingen, 1948]; and *Luther als Ausleger der Synoptiker*, by Walther von Loewenich [Münich, 1954]. Important English works on Luther are: *Let God be God*, by Philip S. Watson [1947], *The Righteousness of God*, by Gordon Rupp [1953], and Schwarz's book, *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation* [1955], but they do not specifically treat him as an interpreter of the Scriptures.

no man doubts,' and in numerous passages the Scriptures refer to this. ' But that in the Scriptures some things are confused and not all is clearly comprehensible ' was merely an assertion, which its champions had never proved and never would. If doubts had arisen as to the clarity and comprehensibility of the Scriptures that was Satan's work. The Devil had awakened these doubts because he wanted to replace the Scriptures by the rule of philosophy. And in the Catholic Church he had to a great extent succeeded.

Luther certainly admits that many passages of Scripture are obscure and confused. But they are so, he says, ' not because they are too high for us, but because of our ignorance of words and grammar.' It is our own fault, therefore, if we do not completely understand Scripture; by continuous and solid study of language and grammar we can overcome this difficulty. But even before we have got so far we are given a helping hand. For what is told us in one part of Scripture in words that are still incomprehensible, is set forth clearly and comprehensibly elsewhere. And above all, these obscurities only concern subordinate matters.

' For what more sublime than this can be hidden in the Scriptures, that after the stone is rolled away from the door of the sepulchre, that highest secret of all is proclaimed, that Christ, the Son of God, has become man; that God is threefold yet one; that Christ suffered for us and will reign for ever' (W.A., xviii. 606).

When Erasmus adduced Ro 11^{33}, ' unsearchable are his judgments,' it was the judgment of God that was meant, not that of Scripture. And in Is 40^{13} it was the same. Whoever did not find in Scripture the clarity he sought must blame himself. His mind was darkened so that he could not grasp the unequivocal statements of Scripture. ' What has completely innocent Scripture done to you, that you blame Holy Scripture in its purity for the misuse of it by wicked men ? ' Luther asks Erasmus.

There is, it is true, Luther concedes, a ' double meaning ' (*eine doppelte Klarheit*) of Scripture, just as there is a ' double obscurity '—an outward (meaning), obtained by the help of the word, another that lies in the knowledge of the heart. So far as the ' inner clarity ' is concerned, no man will understand that in any case, for all have darkened hearts—no man believes (of himself) in the existence of God, or knows himself aright as His creature. Only he will be able to understand Scripture as a whole or in its separate parts, to whom the Spirit of God has been given. For without it no one will perceive or understand anything in Scripture rightly, not even when he has the most intimate acquaintance with its contents :

' If you, however, speak of the " outward meaning," then nothing at all has been left obscure or in doubt, but everything which is contained anywhere at all in Scripture has been brought by the Word into the clearest light and laid before all the world ' (W. A., xviii. 608).

At the same time we must take care to stay within the limits set by Scripture itself. Human curiosity that wants to go beyond Scripture must blame itself and not Scripture if the undertaking fails. And finally : When we consult Scripture we must keep to its text and its actual meaning : a figurative, metaphorical interpretation is to be allowed only when the unequivocal wording of a passage demands it. Otherwise in every case ' we must follow the simple, pure and natural meaning of the words, as demanded by grammar and the usage of language created by God among men.' For if it be permitted even to one man to expound Scripture according to his own judgment and to interpret the clear text figuratively, ' what will the Scriptures be then but a reed shaken by the wind ? ' Nothing will stand fast any longer, but all may be interpreted as it pleases men's wit and will.

So much for Luther's work *De Servo Arbitrio*.

A few months earlier Luther published his challenge to Karlstadt : ' Against the heavenly prophets—concerning images and the Sacrament.' Here, as the title implies, the subject is whether images should be retained in churches, and the problem of the Lord's Supper. Where does Karlstadt get his interpretation of the words of Holy Communion ? asks Luther. Not from Scripture, but out of his own head. He sets to work with a preconceived idea and puts into the gospel words meanings they do not bear at all. What Luther says here about Karlstadt's exegesis applies no less to much modern exposition :

' This spiritual interpretation of Paul by Dr. Karlstadt seems to him and his followers precious and apt; but, when one looks at it in the light of the text, it turns out to be nothing but mere (exegetical) clowning. For there is neither reason nor truth in it; it is an invention of his own forced violently on the text ' (W. A., xviii. 180).

He too, said Luther, had formerly treated the gospel thus. It was easy to talk in this way, but what happened to the wording of the Scriptures ?

' Natural speech is sovereign, and stands higher than all subtle, cunning, sophistic inventions; from it we must not stray till forced to by an obvious article of faith. Otherwise no single letter of the gospel would withstand clerical jugglers ' (W.A., xviii. 180).

The wording of Holy Scripture is authoritative. We must hold by it and submit to it. Should we come across an interpretation which carries us beyond what stands written plain and simple we must ask ourselves whether it is legitimate. And the more brilliant the interpretation we are offered, the more distrustful we must become, in order not inadvertently to be turned away from the Word of God to mere human invention.

What then is the basis for Scriptural interpretation in this literal sense? Luther's answer is: knowledge of the original tongues in which the Bible was written. Not quite a year before his answer to Karlstadt Luther spoke about this in detail in his publication: 'To the councillors of all the towns of Germany, that they may establish and maintain Christian schools.' Right at the beginning of his explanation he comes to the arguments which (then as now) were put forward against the demand for study of the gospel in the original tongues.

'Once more you object: even if we ought to and must have schools, what is the use of teaching Latin, Greek and Hebrew, and other liberal arts? Could we not teach the Bible and the Word of God that is necessary for our salvation in good German? My answer is: Yes, too well I know that we Germans must always be and remain brutes and wild beasts, as our neighbours call us and we well deserve' (W.A., xv. 36).

You will say that is a rough answer. But Luther speaks thus in the interests of his case. For it is the devil, he says, who would like to prevent the spread of knowledge of Latin and Greek lest a breach be made in his empire that he could not repair. Once the gospel came through the Holy Ghost and only through Him does it come to us daily anew. But what is just as indisputable, it has come to us through the medium of the sacred languages. Luther even writes:

'And let this be said to us: we shall not preserve the gospel aright without the (original) languages. They are the sheath, in which the sword of the Spirit is encased; they are the box, in which this jewel is carried; they are the vessel which contains this draught; they are the cupboard where this food is kept. And as the gospel itself shows, they are the baskets in which bread and fish and fragments are preserved. When we, I say, by our neglect, let the tongues go, we shall not only lose the gospel, but will end by being unable to speak or read aright even Latin or German itself' (W.A., xv. 38).

If the Faith comes to naught it is our fault because we do not know the original tongues. Research on the original text, even down to palaeographical detail, and the discussion of variants is not a supplement to exegesis; it is no idle amusement for arm-chair theologians, no pedantry; on the contrary it provides the basis for all exegesis, wherever it is done. If this basis is forgotten or despised you destroy the source which supplies all regions of ecclesiastical life and work.

What is the essential thing then when we take up the Bible? Have we before us a book all parts of which are for us of equal meaning and value? Luther answers: No. Here also we possess a complete group of utterances by Luther from which we can read his meaning in its context. I refer to his prefaces to the separate books of the Bible which he gradually added between 1522 and 1534 to his different editions of the Bible in German to assist the Church in their Bible study. In addition, along with the Old Testament (besides his dissertation against Karlstadt) come his *Instructions to Christians on how to Understand Moses* [1525], originally a sermon, but very quickly disseminated as a preface (in the German edition of Luther's sermons on Genesis), so that outwardly as well as in its contents it is parallel to the prefaces printed with his translation of the Bible. Moreover, with the New Testament we have his *Short Instruction on what is to be sought and expected in the Gospel*, which Luther actually wrote as a preface to his sermons for the Christmas season of 1522, and which therefore comes into the same class as his Bible prefaces. Unfortunately far too little attention is paid to Luther's prefaces, for otherwise many a misunderstanding under which we in Germany, for example, suffer would not have arisen.

Let us go through these prefaces. Already in 1522 Luther writes in his preface to the Book of Revelation:

'As to this Book of Revelation, I let every one think as he pleases, and wish to bind no one to my opinion or judgment. I say what I feel. I miss various things in this book, so that I take it for neither apostolic nor prophetic: first and foremost, the apostles do not have dealings with visions but prophesy in clear, blunt words, like Peter and Paul and Christ in the gospel, as befits the apostolic office, telling clearly, intelligibly and without images or visions about Christ and His work' (W.A., *Deutsche Bibel*, vii. 404).

Every man might think of the Apocalypse as seemed right to him: 'My mind cannot reconcile itself to this book.' Christ was here neither taught nor acknowledged, which was the apostle's first task. 'Therefore I keep to those books which bring Christ before us clear and whole' (W.A., *Deutsche Bibel*, vii. 404). Luther did, it is true, replace this preface in 1530 by another in which he revised his attitude and essayed an interpretation of the Book of Revelation. But even so his attitude is essentially unaltered.

And, further, in the same first edition of the New Testament of 1522 Luther writes in the foreword to the Epistle of James that he cannot agree

with the ancients who rejected the Epistle. But neither can he regard it as the work of an apostle. In contrast to Paul and the rest of the New Testament, the Epistle of James ascribes justification to works; its whole trend is legalistic, but it so confuses the issues that one can only conclude that this is the work of a later writer. In comparison with the real New Testament writings the Epistle of James is 'a right strawy Epistle,' and has 'no tang of the gospel in it,' he says elsewhere in the prefaces (W.A., *Deutsche Bibel*, vi. 10).

On the Epistle of Jude Luther says that to him it is undoubtedly an extract from the Second Epistle of Peter. Both content and language show that it is not the Apostle Jude who is writing but some one of a later date.

On the Epistle to the Hebrews Luther declares finally, in his preface, also written in 1522:

'. . . first: it has been shown that this Epistle to the Hebrews is not by Paul or any apostle . . . It seems to me it is a case of an epistle put together from many fragments and not of the same standard throughout' (W.A., *Deutsche Bibel*, vii. 344).

Who wrote this epistle 'is unknown and will probably remain so for some time to come. That is in any case not the point. The teaching should be all that concerns us.'

To sum up: critical consideration of Scriptural externals, of the earthen vessel in which we have the gospel treasure, has nothing to do with belief or unbelief. The critical work of scholarship on the New Testament is not only justified, but is itself part of exegesis. And if it turns our attention and our trust away from the external authorities, who wrote the New Testament, and towards Him of whom it is written, then it is in fact the indispensable prerequisite for exegesis. For why ought we to trust what is reported to us and what is demanded of us in the New Testament? Surely because the Holy Ghost in our hearts convinces us of the truth of what is there reported and commanded. We respect the authors of the New Testament because of what they report and command. It should not be the other way round, as unfortunately is all too often the case, that we believe the reports and obey the commands because we respect the authors of the Gospels. This attitude is by no means even catholic; the reverse alone is evangelical and corresponds to Luther's demands.

What, then, is Luther's standard for valuing the Biblical books? Let us listen again to the preface to the Epistle of James:

'The office of a true apostle is to preach the passion and resurrection and the ministry of Christ, and to lay the foundation for this faith. . . . And therein all honest sacred books agree, they all preach Christ. And that is the proper touchstone for judging all books, that one should see whether they treat of Christ or not. Since all Scripture witnesses to Christ (Ro $3^{22ff.}$), and Paul is determined not to know anything save Christ (1 Co 2^{2}), that which does not teach Christ is not apostolic, even though Peter and Paul should teach it. In turn, that which teaches Christ *is* apostolic, even though Judas, Annas, Pilate and Herod were to propound it' (W.A., *Deutsche Bibel*, vii. 384).

Luther goes further than any criticism has ever gone: if Judas, the traitor, Annas, who had his own share in Jesus' death (Jn 18^{13-24}), Pilate, who delivered up our Lord to death, Herod, who stands in the New Testament as the type of the unscrupulous monarch devoid of all conscience—if one of these four men had written a scripture which bore faithful witness to Christ, then that scripture would be to Luther apostolic, and equal to the other books of the New Testament. Here we have Luther's point put in an extreme fashion: it is the content that decides the worth of the New Testament; the books of the Bible are to be judged on their content, on the validity of their witness to Christ. Compared with that all external authorities are as nothing.

'That which treats of Christ'—that is Luther's standard for judging the Bible. [*To be continued.*

Recent Foreign Theology

1 and 2 Thessalonians. Within a few months of the appearance of the French commentary of Béda Rigaux on the Epistles to the Thessalonians in the great Roman Catholic series, a French Protestant commentary on the same books by Charles Masson has appeared.[1] The Introduction is here quite brief, and the Greek text is not given, in accordance with the general character of the series. The text and commentary alternate, and the commentary is much less detailed than in the work of Rigaux. On the first Epistle the two authors are in agreement. Both accept its authenticity and assign it to about the same time. Masson puts it in the spring of A.D. 51 or the spring of 52. On the second Epistle, however, they are not in agreement. For whereas Rigaux accepts its authenticity, Masson

[1] *Les deux Épitres de Saint Paul aux Thessaloniciens* (*Commentaire du Nouveau Testament*, XII. a) [1957]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchatel and Paris; Swiss Fr. 8·50.

rejects it. The decisive argument for its rejection he rests on the eschatological teaching of 2 Th 2^{1-12}, which he holds to be inconsistent with that of the genuine Pauline epistles. He considers the various ways in which the Pauline authorship has been defended, including Eduard Schweizer's view that the Epistle was really a second Epistle to the Philippians, only to reject them all. While this commentary will inevitably be compared with that of Rigaux, and must suffer in many respects by the comparison, all students of these Epistles will be rewarded by the study of both. The value of a commentary lies in its detailed comments and here Masson has not a little to contribute.

Mark and History. In the Swiss series of *Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments* an American Professor, J. M. Robinson, of Emory University, has published a study of the attitude of Mark to history.[1] He argues that the Evangelist was less concerned to write a life of Jesus than to select his material to illustrate his eschatological interpretation of the meaning of the ministry of our Lord in terms of its cosmic significance. He finds the key to this interpretation in the introduction to the Gospel, and in the passages dealing with demons and exorcism, in which a cosmic battle with the forces of evil is indicated, and the passages interpreting and describing the crucifixion of Jesus. The author of the Gospel looked back to the ministry of Jesus from the standpoint of his own day, and was not so much interested in saying that the Messiah had come as that this battle between good and evil had taken place, and that the Resurrection had demonstrated the victory achieved in the Cross. The author does not refer to the Dead Sea Scrolls, but in view of the frequently stressed links between the Scrolls and the New Testament, it is surprising that he did not underline the contrast between this and the Battle of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness, to which the sect of the Scrolls looked forward, a battle to be fought with swords and spears, and to be won by killing rather than by dying.

Dictionary of Biblical Archaeology. The late Professor W. Corswant had collected before his death the material for an unusual Bible Dictionary, and this material has been edited, supplemented and now published by E. Urech, under the title of a *Dictionary of Biblical Archaeology*.[2] Professor Parrot, whose standing in archaeology is well known, has written a Preface. In some respects the book is disappointing, but this is owing to its somewhat misleading title. The reader will expect to find here in a handy form for reference particulars about the archaeological finds bearing on the Old Testament, and especially on its history. He will learn some things about the daily life of the ancient Hebrews which archaeology has made known, but he will not readily find anything about the history of Israel, as it is illustrated from the monuments, and he will not be able to find out the sites at which archaeological work has been carried out. He will find no entry on the Dead Sea Scrolls, or on the Ras Shamra texts or the Lachish letters, though he may find references to some texts under *Écriture*. The volume is rather a dictionary of the daily life of the Hebrews, and as such it is of real value. The entries are all short, and many of them rest more on the Old Testament itself than on archaeology. The flora and fauna of Palestine are included.

Theocracy and Monarchy in Israel. A Dutch work by Dr. A. A. Koolhaas, with a summary in English, is devoted to the study of Theocracy and Monarchy in Israel.[3] The author contests the thesis of ' patternism,' and maintains that we know too little of the status of the king in the various ancient Near Eastern communities to justify the assumption of a common pattern throughout the area. He presents the organization of Israel down to the establishment of the monarchy as a theocracy with a charismatic leader, beside whom stood the priest, whose position was more restricted. He accepts what is normally regarded as the later account of the establishment of the monarchy in 1 Samuel as the more authentic. According to this the monarchy represented dissatisfaction with the theocracy. At the same time Dr. Koolhaas finds more unity in 1 S 8–12 than most scholars find. The author is well acquainted with a wide literature, which he approaches from a conservative position. At some points the reviewer would agree with him, though at others he is not persuaded. He is probably right in denying that the Israelite kings were priest-kings, though on occasion they exercised priestly functions as the representatives of the people. On the other hand, it is doubtful if we should speak of a central sanctuary, indicated by the presence of the Ark, in the period of the Judges.

H. H. Rowley

Manchester University

---

[1] *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Markus-Evangeliums* [1956]. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich.

[2] *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Biblique* [1956]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchatel and Paris ; Swiss Fr. 20·30.

[3] *Theocratie en Monarchie in Israel* [1957]. Veenman en Zonen, Wageningen.

I and Thou

By the Reverend H. Howard Williams, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Watford

Martin Buber's book *Ich und Du* was first published in 1923, but its significance and quality earned a growing appreciation among English-speaking people through the translation by Gregor Smith in 1937. Thinkers may be led independently to similar forms of thought but many recent writers on the world of men and things acknowledge an incalculable debt to the pioneer work of Buber. In the teaching of Buber God is known not by disinterested discussion as of a third person in his absence but by direct encounter, the relation of an 'I' with a 'Thou.' Moreover there is a radical difference between man's attitude to other men and his attitude to things. The one is a relation between persons, the other a connexion with objects. The direct and indirect influences which have come through Buber are so interwoven that they cannot easily be separated.

The book makes no claim to being precise and systematic. It is marked by the most moving poetic insights and occasionally the deceptive simplicity of the theme borders on obscurity. This is to be expected because here we find reflection on 'an ultimate in the world of being.' Just as it is often difficult to specify the points on which Buber influenced others so it is difficult to trace the thinkers who influenced him. Yet Buber did not discover the I–Thou relationship. Wilhelm Dilthey, particularly, had sought to make clear the distinction between the social and physical sciences. Moreover we may suspect that in this country, among British teachers, there was some effort to offer thoughts about God and man in personal terms. This may be seen in the writings of Thomas Erskine and the development of certain aspects of his teaching by F. D. Maurice and McLeod Campbell.

A few years ago when I was reading in the National Library of Scotland I came across some correspondence between Thomas Erskine of Linlathen and Samuel Brown.[1] Erskine was one of the great creative Christian thinkers of Scotland, so nearly forgotten that many have had an opportunity of claiming an originality they do not deserve. Samuel Brown's interest was given to the transmutation of elements. In 1841 he put two propositions on paper: (1) that iron is convertible into rhodium by one transformative process; (2) that silver is convertible into gold by one transformative process. These scientific ideas may not encourage much trust in his theological insights. The letters were written by Erskine but in them he refers to a paper called 'I–Thou' which Brown was writing. The correspondence which begins in 1848 with a reference to Brown's paper on 'I–Thou' ends on 5th October, 1849 with a lament from Erskine because Brown had decided that I and Thou was to remain in his drawer. Unfortunately the correspondence is incomplete for us, because only Erskine's letters have been preserved and Brown's MS. seems to have disappeared. Yet we may see something of the quality of Brown's thought in the comments made by Erskine in his own letters.

29th May 1848[2] Erskine thanks Samuel Brown for his paper referring to it as 'This cup of water in a thirsty land.' He comments '. . . I think that I accept your analysis—at least I feel that *infinite Thou* is the only complement of *finite I*, and until my spirit meets this Thou I am a fragment. As an illustration of the meaning of prayer your argument is beautiful. . . . Prayer is evidently the true menothesis[3] and it differs from meditation and reflection, in that these convert Thou into He—and are thus a sensible falling off from unity with God, which is perfected by prayer saying Abba Father.

'I have been struck by the harmony of some remarkable passages in the Bible with your meaning—When the prodigal comes to himself he says, I will arise and go to *him* and will say to him *Thou*.

'And Job when he is lifted out of his perplexities says, I have heard of Thee (as of a him) by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth Thee, etc.

'Your logic as to the direct antithesis of the *I* not being the *non moi*, appears to me satisfactory—I personal, I finite, I created am the thesis—and my antithesis must meet this thesis.'

Erskine ends this letter by urging Brown to look at the Psalms.

Another letter reads as follows '. . . John xvii. 3[4] is an exemplification of the relation of Thou to

[1] For Erskine, see H. F. Henderson, *Erskine of Linlathen* [1899] and *Letters of Thomas Erskine*, ed. W. Hanna, 2 vols. [1877]. For Brown, see *D.N.B.*, vii. 28.

[2] *National Library of Scotland MS.* [1889]: *Correspondence of Samuel Brown.*

[3] Menothesis—this mysterious word seems to be used throughout in the sense of 'synthesis.'

[4] Jn 17[3] 'And this is life eternal, that (ἵνα) they might know thee the only true God.'

I as its proper complement. The ἵνα should be translated *when* as in Homer [1]—Man by losing his knowledge of the great Thou has lost everlasting life—he recovers it when he knows *Thee*—he continues in dwarfhood and obstruction till then—immediately he dilates into his full proportions. I see and feel that *He* is off the straight, *Thou* is the direct line—and the moment my heart says it I flow along the whole line and lose myself in the *Thou*. I suppose the true menothesis is the God-man—the word in flesh—bringing God into man, drawing man up to God. I think I called prayer the menothesis in my former note—I don't know the technical terms well—but prayer is surely the normal state of man, the state in which he receives infinity and enters into it. The moment Thou becomes He, prayer ceases and communion ceases.' Erskine adds 'observe the expression of this in Psalm cxlii. 4 and 5 [2] it requires Thou.'

It will be seen that Erskine's immediate concern in these letters is to recognize the claim made upon men by the Eternal Thou—the God who may only be 'addressed, not expressed.' As in Buber we find a similar understanding of the essential tension between two conceptions known, theologically, as transcendence and immanence. Buber writes, 'Of course God is the "wholly Other"; but He is also the wholly same, the wholly Present. Of course He is the *Mysterium Tremendum* that appears and overthrows; but He is also the mystery of the self-evident, nearer to me than my *I*.' [3] This same theme is found in Erskine in his attraction to William Law and also his firm hold on the Sovereignty of God. He was repelled by a passive mysticism, by all religious teaching clothed in amorous metaphors. Criticising the teaching of Madame Guyon, he writes 'I am formed to be a receiver and a continual receiver, but at the same time I must judge and choose what I ought to receive.' [4] Yet, Erskine argued, the teaching of Calvin had been so cruelly developed in Scotland that men were utterly incapable of understanding theological teaching which was phrased in personal terms.

It is in this setting of a rigorous and closely knit theological system that we must appreciate Erskine's plea for a meeting and an encounter with the living God. When all was made subordinate to the sovereign act of God, in election, the character of God remained hidden behind a veil fabricated by systematized theology. Erskine was more concerned with the living issues of religion than with any theological theory. He rebelled, as did McLeod Campbell a little later, against a system which emphasized the legal rather than the personal, and law and justice rather than fatherhood and forgiveness. 'Religion in Scotland,' wrote Erskine, 'is too much a thing of science, and too little a thing of personal application and interest.' [5]

So far we have shown some similarity between the thought of Erskine and Brown and the teaching of Buber on man's encounter with the Eternal Thou. Buber also emphasizes the distinction between man's proper attitude to other men and his attitude to things. He teaches that true community is to be found in a group of people being united in their relation to the Eternal Thou. This is the source of true community. At the beginning of the nineteenth century it was a crying need that some one should express the nature of the personal and assert its right to be taken seriously. It was a weakness of Erskine's thought that, unlike F. D. Maurice, whom he so strongly influenced, he failed to take the practical step towards social ethics. Erskine during his long life (1788–1870) saw the incoming tide of the assertion of popular rights. He viewed with some alarm the rise of the democratic spirit and questioned the wisdom and the validity of the claims made by the people. It was a time of widespread destitution and unrest but Erskine, numbered among the landed gentry, does not seem to have realized the agony of the times and, unlike Maurice in England, he did not make any positive contribution to the cause of the people, apart from his personal sympathy. Maurice, himself, did not begin to find his own contribution until 1848 although he had shared his mother's judgment and sympathy in her letter describing the Bristol riots of 1830.[6] Erskine, however, was primarily concerned to emphasize the true nature of man in a brotherhood born of love. In a letter to Carlyle he claims that God had created men for some purpose other than 'making steam engines and railroads, and solacing themselves with roast beef and pudding.' [7] The following year (1848) he writes, 'I wish we had some popular exposition of the question—how much can a government do for a people? and how much must a people do for themselves? . . . no act of parliament can make up to a man for the loss of a heavenly Father, and the brotherly relation with all men which that relation creates.' [8]

[1] Erskine's exegesis is always interesting even when it may be wrong (MS. 1890).

[2] Ps 142[4, 5] 'I looked on my right hand, and beheld, but there was no man that would know me. . . . I cried unto thee, O Lord: I said, Thou art my refuge. . . .'

[3] *I and Thou*, Eng. tr., 79.

[4] Hanna, *op. cit.*, ii. 5, 7.

[5] Hanna, *op. cit.*, i. 75.

[6] For Maurice's social ethics see Wood, *F. D. Maurice*, ch. 8.

[7] *National Library of Scotland MS.* [1766]: *Letter to Carlyle, September 1847.*

[8] *Ib.*, MS. [1766]: *Letter to Carlyle, March 1848.*

Erskine was content, therefore, to emphasize the spiritual nature of man and leave the development of social ethics to others. Yet the root of the matter was in him for by his own emphasis on the Incarnation and his teaching on Christ as the Head of humanity he began a line of thought which was taken over by Maurice and more fully developed by him. Erskine sought to express the nature of the personal through the relationship of man with God and man with man. He affirmed a necessary and eternal relationship between Christ and humanity. Christ is the Head of the race and everything He did 'is in its principle to be reproduced in us.'[1] The whole theory of Christ's Divine Headship of humanity is basic to Erskine's thought. Occasionally he varies his language in expressing this view, but whether he is indebted to the Fourth Gospel or to St. Paul's Letter to the Romans for the form of his language, the meaning is the same. 'The whole nature,' he writes in *The Brazen Serpent*, 'is as one colossal man, of which Christ continues the head during the whole accepted time and day of salvation; and according to this head, is the whole at present dealt with.'[2] The first Adam as the head embraced all in the Fall; Christ as the new Head tasted death for all and embraced all in His resurrection. God's will is made known not in a spoken word but in the amazing truth that He consented to be made of one blood with us. God has created and redeemed mankind in Christ. Yet Christ is not simply a fact of history for He holds an eternal relationship with all men. Christ dwells in the flesh of men, the place where God has been dishonoured. Christ is in the flesh whether men recognize it or not, but until they know it they cannot live the life of the Spirit of God, for spiritual things are spiritually discerned. Wherever men find signs of true humanity there is the Spirit of Christ, for all truth inevitably proceeds from the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

In ways such as these Thomas Erskine tried to give his teaching about God and man in personal terms. Maurice endeavoured to make this high view of man something real in society. He, along with his friends, was not committed to any particular form of economic organization but they believed that 'things should be subordinate to persons and that wealth should subserve welfare and they looked to the working classes to bring this to pass.'[3]

[1] *The Spiritual Order*, 160.

[2] P. 38. See 1 Co 11[3], Ro 5, Jn 15.

[3] Wood, *op. cit.*, 157.

Contributions and Comments

How Many Times Does 'Epiousios' Occur Outside the Lord's Prayer?

It is a truism of New Testament lexicography that the meaning of any Greek word in the New Testament must be ascertained in the light of its meaning in classical Greek, the Septuagint, the *koine* (both literary and non-literary), and even, at times, Byzantine and modern Greek. In the latest edition of Walter Bauer's standard Greek Lexicon of the New Testament,[1] one finds under the word ἐπιούσιος reference to a papyrus document which is said to contain the word, and under σήμερον reference to a Greek inscription which has been interpreted as containing ἐπιούσιος. Except for these two possible examples, no other occurrence of ἐπιούσιος outside the Lord's Prayer is known. Unfortunately, however, with respect to these two examples things are far from being satisfactory. The situation is as follows.[2]

Until about thirty years ago, the word ἐπιούσιος was unknown to theologians outside the context of the Lord's Prayer. Quite understandably this adjective (the only adjective in the Lord's Prayer) had been the object of much discussion as to its derivation and meaning. Then in 1925 the classical philologist, Albert Debrunner, reported in *Theologische Literaturzeitung* for 7th March [col. 119] that the word had been found in a fragmentary Greek papyrus of a householder's account-book listing the purchase of provisions.[3] An astonishing

[1] W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. A Translation and Adaptation of Walter Bauer's *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, usw., 4th ed., 1952 [1957].

[2] The material in the next four paragraphs of this communication, except for two of the footnotes, was published by the author under the title, 'Num bis relata sit, extra orationem Dominicam, vox *epiousios*?' in *Verbum Domini*, xxiv. [1956] 349 f., and is used here with the permission of the editor, Max Zerwick, S.J.

[3] Debrunner has given repeated attention to the word ἐπιούσιος; for a bibliographical list of eight other articles and notes written by him, and dealing with various aspects of its form and meaning, see *Sprachgeschichte und Wortbedeutung; Festschrift Albert Debrunner* . . . [Bern, 1954], 448 ff.

aspect of Debrunner's announcement was the circumstance that this Greek papyrus had been published thirty-six years before its significance for the Lord's Prayer was appreciated![1] When therefore it was reported by E. V[ogt] in *Biblica*, xxxv. [1954] 136 f. that the Berlin paleographer, Günther Klaffenbach, had discovered the second occurrence of this word in a context other than the Lord's Prayer, one not only rejoiced because of that fact, but also because only four years had elapsed between the discovery and its announcement in a Biblical journal.[2] But this joy was short-lived, for, upon further investigation, it became apparent that Klaffenbach had pursued a will-o'-the-wisp. The following is a summary of the 'discovery.'

In 1941 Chr. Blinkenberg published a Greek inscription from the acropolis at Lindos, on Rhodes, in which there appeared the words *τω ιερει τας Αθανας εν[ια]υσιω*.[3] After giving some study to the inscription, Klaffenbach argued that the sense of this phrase must be something like 'to the coming, the next (*i.e.*, chosen for the next year) priest of Athene.' But since *ἐνιαύσιος* does not bear this meaning, Klaffenbach suggested that the correct reconstruction must be *ἐπ[ιο]υσίῳ*, dropping a footnote to the effect that 'Blinkenberg hat also lediglich N und *Π* verlesen.' What shall one say of this?

In checking the copious *index verborum* of Blinkenberg's magnificent edition of the hundreds of inscriptions discovered at Lindos, one finds that, although *ἐνιαύσιος* appears only once (namely in this disputed passage), *ἐνιαυτός* appears frequently (nineteen times). Furthermore, one observes that in the immediately succeeding context of this inscription reference is made to the *τοι επισταται τοι αρχοντε[ς] [τ]ον επ ιερεων Καλλ[ιστρ]ατου και Ροδοπειθευς ενιαυ[τον] . . .*, which must mean something like 'the Epistatai, who are in office during the year that Kallistratos and Rhodopeithēs are priests. . . .' Now, it turns out that this Kallistratos is the previously named *ἱερεὺς ἐνιαύσιος*. One begins to doubt, then, whether Klaffenbach was justified in urging that the context demands that *ὁ ἐνιαύσιος ἱερεύς* means 'the coming, the next priest.' A glance at Blinkenberg's tables of priests at Lindos[4] discloses the information that it was customary for each priest to serve for one year. There is, in fact, no reason to take the phrase in question in any other sense than 'the priest for a year.'

After having come to this tentative conclusion, the present writer decided to request from the National Museum of Copenhagen, where the monument is now deposited, a 'squeeze' of the line in question to determine whether Blinkenberg did or did not misread *Π* as N. Just before writing, however, it was discovered that Debrunner had already made a similar inquiry,[5] and had learned that there is no doubt that Blinkenberg had transcribed the word correctly.[6] Thus one must regretfully conclude that there is still but one recorded instance of *ἐπιούσιος* in a context other than the Lord's Prayer.

The word 'recorded' in the preceding sentence has been chosen deliberately, for, according to information given the author by T. C. Skeat of the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum, the papyrus householder's list cannot now be found! The document was one of the Hawara papyri which Petrie deposited in University College, London. 'Most of them,' writes Skeat in a letter dated 12th August, 1956, 'are still there but several, including this vital one, have disappeared (I expect Petrie lent them to friends who omitted to return them).' This is all the more distressing in view of the possibility that its editor, Sayce, may have misread the papyrus.[7] As Skeat points out in a subsequent letter to the present writer (dated 6th March, 1957), Sayce's 'shortcomings as a decipherer are generally recognized—see, for example, Griffith's balanced obituary notice in *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* [1933]. Ample examples can be gleaned from almost any of Sayce's publications, for example, the two papyri published by him in 1890 and recently re-discovered by [E. G.] Turner in University College (*Journ. Eg. Arch.* [1952], 132–133).'

Until this papyrus is found again, therefore, the cautious lexicographer must perforce rely on the context of the Lord's Prayer, on etymological

[1] The papyrus was published by Sayce in W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Hawara, Biahmu, and Arsinoe* [1889], p. 34, No. 245. The text of the papyrus was reprinted by Fr. Preisigke in his *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*, i. [Strassburg, 1915], No. 5224.

[2] Klaffenbach's article appeared in the fourth fascicle of the sixth volume of *Museum Helveticum* [1949; published in March, 1950], 216 f.

[3] Chr. Blinkenberg, *Lindos. Fouilles de l'ácropole 1902–1914*; II; *Inscriptions*, ii. [Berlin and Copenhagen, 1941], No. 419, col. 777, line 18.

[4] *Op. cit.*, II, i., cols. 143 ff.

[5] Albert Debrunner, '"Epiousios" und kein Ende,' *Museum Helveticum*, vol. ix., fasc. 1 [Januar, 1952], 60–62.

[6] More recently the Greek epigrapher, Marcus N. Tod, called attention to Klaffenbach's erroneous reconstruction (*Church Quarterly Review*, clviii. [1957] 49–51).

[7] Sayce reported (in Petrie, *op. cit.*) that he found *ἐπιουσι*.

considerations, and on Patristic and versional evidence in seeking to ascertain the meaning of this elusive word.

BRUCE M. METZGER

Princeton Theological Seminary,
Princeton, New Jersey, U.S.A.

Theological and Linguistic

DR. MACQUARRIE'S interesting article on 'Changing Attitudes to Religion in Contemporary English Philosophy' (in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxviii. 298) included some discussion of my study of poetical and religious language in *Metaphysical Beliefs* [1957]. While agreeing with many of his points, I am a little perplexed at the position Dr. Macquarrie accords my essay in the current theological and linguistic controversy.

In 'Poetry and Religious Belief' I tried to do two things: (1) to show as sympathetically as possible how tempting and plausible is the analogy between poetic imagery and religious imagery, between poetic aberrations from 'ordinary language' and theological aberrations. Does the forcefulness of this analogy help to alleviate problems about the meaningfulness of religious language? Some people to-day are saying yes. In describing such 'image-theologies,' however, I was far from stating my own personal views. (Dr. Macquarrie mistakenly assumes this in saying that Austin Farrer's 'work has much in common with Hepburn's approach.') (2) I tried to show that, despite its attractiveness, this analogy is too weak to serve as a foundation for a durable apologetic. For it is surely possible to have an imaginative work in which a most impressive system of interpenetrating symbols, types, images is deployed—a system which, nevertheless, may *not* mediate a reliable picture of the real world. Similarly, to accept a story, say the gospel story, may be psychologically and therapeutically of the utmost value: and yet in saying that about it nothing has been said about its status as fact or fiction. The need to make this distinction prevents me from accepting Dr. Macquarrie's suggestion that the problem of the 'reference' of the religious symbols, etc. need not be raised. To deal with that problem of reference, we must either rehabilitate rational theology, or else pin our belief to some sort of irreducibly direct *I-Thou* encounter with God.

The fact that to-day I find myself forced into a reluctant (and reverent) agnosticism is the measure of my inability as yet to find either of these alternatives ultimately satisfying. Dr. Macquarrie is right in placing me among those linguistic philosophers who wish to study theological language in very much greater detail than positivism ever did: but I am sorry that I am not entitled to be sandwiched (as I am in his article) between R. M. Hare and R. B. Braithwaite as one of the 'constructive' philosophers of religion.

R. W. HEPBURN

Aberdeen.

In 'sandwiching' Dr. Hepburn between R. M. Hare and R. B. Braithwaite, I had no intention of conscripting him into the ranks of the apologists. The choice of these three writers as 'samples' was made not with regard to what their own beliefs might be, but because each has given a clear exposition of a distinctive approach to theological problems from the standpoint of linguistic philosophy. Their contributions were called 'constructive' in the sense that they go beyond the impatience of the earlier positivists in a serious endeavour to 'make sense' of religious utterances, and that they raise topics which may well bear further discussion. In this sense, Dr. Hepburn's valuable essay certainly appears to me to be constructive. It is true that he reaches no affirmative conclusion in his discussion of religious belief—I pointed out that he 'cannot tell us whether in the end it may not be illusion'—but in treating his theme 'as sympathetically as possible' he has made a contribution to the current controversy which is much more than negative. I am grateful to Dr. Hepburn both for his essay and for the present clarification of his position.

JOHN MACQUARRIE

Glasgow.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

The Blind Farmer

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'Let both grow together until the harvest.'—Mt 13^{30}.

In Cheshire they tell a tale about a little farm that was for sale. One old farmer, now retired, thought he might buy it for his son, and set him up there. So together they set off to see the farm. 'But what's the use of your going to look at it?' one of his neighbours asked the old man; for, you see, he had gone blind. 'Maybe I'll see enough to save me wasting my money,' he replied, and left the neighbour shaking his head.

When they reached the farm, the son described the house and the shippon and the barns to his father with enthusiasm. The old man grunted. 'We'll see the fields,' he said. 'That's what makes a farm.' So they led their horses through a gate and into the middle of a fifteen acre field. 'Here,' barked the old man, 'tie the horses up to a thistle, and let's look round.' 'But, Dad,' said the son, 'there isn't a thistle to be seen.' 'No thistles?' the blind man grunted. 'Then give me back my horse. I'll waste no money on a farm that can't grow thistles.'

It seems from that story as though weeds are a sign that land can bear really good crops. In that case, my garden must boast the best soil for miles around! Certainly there can be no goodness without evil, for we only know how to call a thing good because we can contrast it with something that is bad. We value light because we know how irksome darkness can be. We shun pain because we know the joy of health.

Quite often people ask why God allows evil things to exist in His world. Why doesn't He make everyone good? No one can answer that question fully. But part of the answer is that, if He took away all the evil, He would take away the good as well. Character results from choosing the good *from* the evil, and if we could not choose we should not be sons of God.

There is no great virtue in being honest and truthful when you are in good company, here with your friends in Church, for example. Presumably they are all truth-tellers too, and you would be 'odd man out' if you started to tell whoppers. But when you are with a crowd who are telling exaggerated stories, it is a real temptation to top the lot by romancing in such a way that you make yourself out to be a hero. It takes real courage to say, 'Sorry, I have never driven an express at sixty miles an hour, and I've never let off a squib in the middle of a lesson on quadratics.'

We all admire the monks who, because they saw how many evil things there were in the world, retreated inside the walls of their cloisters. There they prayed, worked at their books, and thought great thoughts with self-forgetful piety. But perhaps the true men of God are those who stay inside the busy world, sharing its troubles, and yet sticking close by that which is right all the time. It almost seems as though God has left both evil and good in His world because there can be growth only when wheat and tares share the field.

Some years ago the east coast herring fishermen fitted their holds with tanks so that they could bring in their catch alive. But the herring seemed to know that they were prisoners, and they turned sluggish and lost their taste by the time they reached market. But there was one captain whose fish always came in fresh, and the buyers almost fought to bid for them. One day his secret slipped out. He confessed that, for every thousand herring he caught and put into his tanks, he put in one catfish. The catfish ate a few herrings, but its presence kept the other herring fresh and lively.

We cannot fully understand the presence of evil in God's world, but I think that, and the words of our Lord's parable in the text have got something to do with it.

Bible Sunday

A Light unto my Path

By the Reverend William Whittle, Oldbury

Trekking through the bush in Ghana can bring lots of surprising adventures. One day, my wife and I had to walk about twenty miles along a narrow track which twisted and turned endlessly as it wound through the thick forest. We had left soon after dawn but in the forest the early mists made it dark and gloomy and even when the sun came up we hardly knew it was there as we walked along mile after mile in the hot and steamy atmosphere.

When we had gone about half way we were startled by the sudden appearance of a small boy who seemed to spring from nowhere. There he stood in the middle of the path, dressed in little more than a broad grin! He was evidently delighted to see us as he had been sent by the chief of his village to intercept us with a request

that I should visit him, some miles away. I decided to go with the messenger while my wife went along with the carriers to the village where we were to spend the night. I would join them as soon as possible. After a very rough and difficult journey I reached the village, had my palaver with the chief and got back to the path with my faithful guide. By this time the afternoon was well advanced and soon we were overtaken by the swift short twilight, and then the darkness of the African night. As we had no lamp there was nothing we could do but stay where we were. I knew my wife would send boys with lamps if I had not arrived by nightfall. We lit a fire to keep away any prowling leopard and as we talked together we could hear the chatter of the monkeys in the trees and the squark of the parrots, and now and again the soft slither through the dry leaves of a lizard or a snake. Then, suddenly, I called out to the boy that I could see lights in the distance, but he laughed aloud knowing that what I saw could only be the ' tail lamps ' of the fireflies just a short distance from my face! Certainly *those* lamps would not bring us home. After what seemed a very long time we heard distant voices singing a well known hymn, faintly at first and then louder and we caught a glimpse of flashing hurricane lamps carried by the boys who were coming to our aid. Soon voices were calling to us through the trees. And then the boys were among us, laughing and dancing with delight at having reached us safely.

So we set off together. We had not gone far before we came to a deep ravine bridged by a tree trunk which had been felled across the gap. And this was the only way of getting across. It was an eerie feeling, balancing oneself along this lonely and perilous track. But just in front of me there walked a boy with his lamp and I noticed the way he held it. He did not lift it up high above his head to light up the forest around us, but low down at the full length of his arm so that the circle of light fell immediately about my feet as I walked carefully, step by step, along the tree trunk. Once across, we stepped out more boldly but still he kept the lamp low, making sure that my feet should never walk in darkness. And as the bright glow shone across my path I thought of a certain text in the hundred and nineteenth Psalm. Do you remember what it is? Here's a clue. It contains the words lamp, light, feet, path. I'll give you another clue. Every verse in that Psalm has a reference to the Scriptures, using different words, such as ' law,' ' truth,' ' word.' In this case it is ' Thy word.' *Now* have you got it? (see *v.* 105). And it is wonderfully true that so long as life lasts, the Bible is indeed ' a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path.'

The Christian Year

SUNDAY NEXT BEFORE ADVENT

The Paradoxes of Our Ministry [1]

II. ' As unknown, and yet well known '

BY THE REVEREND DOUGLAS STEWART, M.A., LONDON

Is St. Paul here referring to the messenger or to the message? The syntax and the general sense of the passage both suggest that he means the messenger ' as deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and, behold we live.' Clearly the first and third phrases describe our situation as Christian preachers. Should we not then take the phrase between them in the same way? But there is something unsatisfactory in this kind of personal reading. It is not important whether we as preachers are known or unknown. What is important is whether or not our message is known. Given the telescopic nature of the whole passage, and the speed of St. Paul's mind, this would seem to be a more satisfying reading. We speak to men of the unknown. And yet we tell them of what is well known.

1. ' Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars' hill, and said, ' Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you.'

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of that passage from the Acts, or its relevance in the modern situation. It is an example of early Christian preaching not addressed to Jews. Here is the Church at grips with her missionary situation. Here the ' aids to preaching ' used by Peter on the day of Pentecost or by Stephen before the Sanhedrin are useless. In particular the appeals to God's mighty acts in the past, and to the fulfilment of prophecy, are impossible. Paul faces an agnostic congregation. God in His mighty acts is not recognized. God in His prophetic word is not known. How does the Christian preacher even begin to speak? To what can he appeal?

God is ' unknown,' and yet God is ' well known.' The paradox this time is not in our minds but in the minds of those to whom we preach. The paradox is that they raise an altar to the God whom they do not know. The paradox is that they, who have no knowledge of God, are yet ' too religious.' Our paradox ' as deceivers, and

[1] A sermon in this series—the Paradoxes in 2 Co 6^{8-10}—will appear each month.—Ed.

yet true' fits their paradox 'as unknown, and yet well known.'

The relevance of this for us is evident. More and more we find ourselves in the missionary situation. The mind of our time is predominantly agnostic. 'We do not know.' We are not confronted by militant atheism except in a fanatical minority. We confront a world which says that it does not know, and which may be sincerely convinced in its more intellectual members that it cannot know.

Here in a curious way Karl Barth is a man of his age. His utter denial of all natural religion; his insistence that God cannot be known or discovered by man, is an unveiling of the modern heart. Man is in despair because deep down he feels that he will never know. There is, of course, the great and positive other side to Barth's thought. But how can the gulf between that 'other side' and his insistence on man's natural agnosticism be spanned? How can revelation in any conceivable form mean anything to a humanity as doomed to agnosticism as Barth suggests?

God is 'unknown.' In all the Christless world man's best endeavour results in an altar to 'the Unknown God.' And yet God is 'well known.' Or why would men build altars at all? It is in this paradoxical situation that we preach: to men who know nothing and who yet know very well what we declare.

Let me place side by side two old Testament passages. The first is from the twenty-third chapter of Job: 'Behold, I go forward, but he is not there; and backward, but I cannot perceive him: On the left hand, where he doth work, but I cannot behold him: he hideth himself on the right hand, that I cannot see him.' The undiscoverable God. The second is from the hundred and thirty-ninth Psalm. 'Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; Even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me. If I say, Surely the darkness shall cover me; even the night shall be light about me. Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day: the darkness and the light are both alike to thee.' The God from whom we cannot escape. These two passages are not alternatives. They are collateral. Both rest in human experience. And so preaching to the agnostics in Athens Paul declares 'in him we live, and move, and have our being.'

In Browning's poem, *Bishop Blougram's Apology*, there is the same appeal to psychological experience. The Bishop invites the agnostic to join him in atheism. 'Let's not believe in God. Now we'll have peace of mind.'

> Just when we are safest, there's a sunset-touch,
> A fancy from a flower-bell, some one's death,
> A chorus-ending from Euripides,—
> And that's enough for fifty hopes and fears
> As old and new at once as nature's self,
> To rap and knock and enter in our soul,
> Take hands and dance there, a fantastic ring,
> Round the ancient idol, on his base again,—
> The grand Perhaps!

God is unknown. Outside of His self-revelation God cannot be known. And yet God is well known. We never preach to a mind or a heart untroubled by awareness of the Divine.

2. St. Paul, of course, does not in his Athenian sermon stop there. He goes on to declare the revelation. He declares the resurrection of Christ from the dead. In a sense the Resurrection is sheer fact to be proved or disproved. It would seem that a man might claim ignorance of the Resurrection as he can never claim ignorance of God. Or he might claim to disprove the Resurrection as he could never claim to disprove the existence of God. How far can we apply the paradox 'as unknown, and yet well known'? Does it apply only to God? Or does it comprehend also the sphere of Christ and the sphere of Christian experience?

Let us begin by considering Dante. To the modern mind he represents 'the unknown' in that the framework of his thought is mediaeval. He sees human life through a dark glass—hell, purgatory, heaven—which we have discarded. He writes of 'the unknown' world beyond the grave. Having said that can we ignore Dante?

'In the middle of the journey of our life I came to myself in a dark wood where the straight way was lost.' With his first sentence Dante pierces to the heart of our human experience. He longs to climb the sunny mountain but three animals bar his path. The caprice of the leopard, the pride of the lion, and the lust of the she-wolf impede him. Thus in a few lines we are inside Dante and he is inside us. He is unknown, and yet well known. And so on and on down through the darkness of hell and up to the bliss of heaven he leads us. It is the framework, the externals, the surface of Dante which is unknown. On a deeper level he is well known. There he describes for us, and interprets, our own experience of life.

One great ally of the modern preacher is depth psychology. It enables us to see the human soul as three dimensional. It helps us to understand that what is being superficially denied may be being profoundly accepted. At one and the same

time and in one and the same hearer we may be 'unknown, and yet well known.'

Let me illustrate this now from the life of a modern poet, Edwin Muir, and I'm following here an interpretation given by Norman Nicholson. He says of Muir, 'For many years he did not accept the doctrines of the Christian faith, but he was profoundly interested in the stories of the Old Testament. He wrote a great many poems about these stories, treating them as myths —stories with hidden depths of significance. And then a strange, and to my mind rather wonderful, thing happened. The poet suddenly realized that, almost without his being aware of it, he himself had become a Christian, he had accepted the Christian faith. By means of his own poetry he had convinced himself.'

Poetry is always proceeding at some depth within the personality. At that depth the Bible stories become luminous. For too long we have been superficial in both thought and apologia. We've sought to defend the historicity of the unhistorical instead of letting the stories speak at their own proper depth. The man and woman in the Garden, their fall, their shame, the long road back, the faith of Abraham, the wandering in the wilderness, the pillar of cloud and the pillar of fire—all this and more, profoundly illuminates the souls of men. It is 'as unknown, and yet well known.' At this level the Bible is 'word of God' and 'bread of God' universally. It speaks to every man.

Can we return now to the resurrection of Christ? We read the New Testament stories in an evidential way. We talk of the Resurrection as 'the best-attested fact of history.' We behave as if we were in a Police Court taking evidence. We assume that the New Testament writers are supplying that kind of evidence. But were they? Is that how they thought of the Resurrection? A fact to be proved? St. Paul in Luke's version of his sermon adduces a fact without proof and yet some cleave to him and believe. As God is unknown and yet well known is Christ unknown and yet well known? Is the Resurrection unknown and yet well known? The Resurrection is historic fact, of course, but is it only historic fact?

Think of the previous paradox, 'as deceivers, and yet true.' The Resurrection is the crucial point of the deception as St. Paul argues in 1 Co 15. There is the awful self-deception of Christians who declare a resurrection which is not true. There is the world deception of the Church which deceives men into a hope which is vain. 'If Christ be not risen.' 'We are deceivers, and yet true.' We speak 'as unknown, and yet well known.' The resurrection of Christ from the dead is sheer contradiction of experience, and yet, as Mr. C. S. Lewis has argued so persuasively in *Miracles*, it is consonant with the whole of experience. All around us year by year we watch the drama of death and resurrection. And deep within us all our lives we have witnessed the drama of death and resurrection. And in the Christ comes the moment of revelation where the natural and the supernatural meet and 'the unknown' is 'well known.'

First Sunday in Advent

The Lamb of God

By the Reverend John L. Kent, M.A., Glasgow

'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.'—Jn 1^{29}.

How did John know that Jesus was the Lamb of God? His ministry had not begun yet John saw its end and all it would accomplish.

Of course, Jesus and John were well known to each other. They were cousins and no doubt had shared much of their boyhood and youth together. Was it on the basis of this experience that John could predict that Jesus would be the sacrificial offering for the sin of the world?

Or was it his prophetic insight that enabled him to make this pronouncement? Two facts were in his possession—the dire need of men and the character of Jesus. From these John may have been able to project his vision into the future and see the inevitable Cross.

More likely it was the bearing and words of Jesus at this moment that imparted this truth to John.

Think of the scene. John is proclaiming his word with relentless power. He is exposing men to themselves and unmasking their sins. Conscience-smitten, they are coming forward for baptism. Here a young woman, drawing her veil over her ashamed face, steps out from the multitude. Yonder a youth, shaken by the sudden realisation of his sin, pushes his way to the front. And there a man of mature years straightens his shoulders and braces himself to begin a new life. Each in turn stands before John, confesses his or her sins, and goes down into the renewing waters. But who is that? Jesus! As He stands there, He seeks the remission not of His own sins but those of His fellow-men. This is the burden that lies on His conscience for the removal of which He goes vicariously into the waters. With a flash it breaks upon John the Baptist, 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.'

We know that on our ordinary human level some people are so closely identified with their fellow-men that they feel the shame of others' sins

as if they were their own. In George Eliot's *Adam Bede* the Methodist preacher, Dinah Morris, goes into the cell where Hetty awaits the extreme penalty of the law for putting her baby to death and feels as if she herself were a part of the crime. Henry Drummond would often come home from one of his meetings where he had been listening to the confessions of men feeling not merely weary and exhausted but sick with the sins of men. In some measure we are all drawn at some point into the life of someone whose waywardness or wickedness is felt as if it were ours.

Because we all enter into this experience we are helped to understand how Jesus Christ, the altogether pure one, felt pressed poignantly upon His consciousness the sins of the world. So closely did He identify Himself with the shame of men that He dedicated Himself as the means for its removal. That is what John saw when he exclaimed, 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' And blessed is the man who makes the same discovery.

Every Christian ought to share with John this revelation—even more clearly than he did. See what it means.

It means that sin is serious. No one can treat sin as seriously as the man who believes that Jesus has made a sacrificial offering for the sin of the world. The materialist sees in it the inevitable and automatic reaction to the pressure of circumstance. His only hope is in the use of force either to suppress it or to mitigate its effects. To the evolutionist it is only the remainder left over from the onward march of man's progress. His cure lies in education. To men of various faiths and of none at all, sin is something to be smiled at, regretted, abominated or even expiated, but never so serious as to the Christian. To him it is solemn, awesome, convicting as he sees the crushing load laid upon the sensitive heart of the Lamb of God.

It means that sin is personal. It is neither a malign power that takes control of people nor an irresistible mechanical process that catches up man in its operations. It is the deliberate choice of erring men and women. Races, governments, and classes do not sin; only people, sometimes alone and individually and sometimes combining in groups.

It means that sin is tragic. The people who gathered on the banks of the Jordan did not belong to a sub-human race. Indeed God had specially chosen them to be the medium of making known His justice and redeeming love to all the world, and many were faithful to that high calling. Their sin was the disobedience of people who had the capacity to express and accomplish the saving will of God. That is why it pierced Jesus to the quick. But all sin is of this nature. A woman whose husband came home drunk every Friday night and badly maltreated her was being pressed by relatives and friends to desert him. 'I can't do that,' she said, 'for he is a good man six days in the week.' That is fundamentally the truth about us all. We are not animals or blackguards or inveterate criminals. We were created with all the potentialities to become the children of God and yet we sin. That is the tragedy of it.

This is man's dire predicament. Because sin is so serious, personal, and tragic he is held in a bondage from which he is impotent to free himself. Here lies his problem. But also it is God's problem. When Jesus went down into the waters of baptism by the river Jordan He was demonstrating God's involvement with the sin of the world. We have not truly understood the serious character of sin when we have seen it merely from the side of man—how universal, how ineradicable, how withering its consequences and how stabbing its guilt. We have to see it from God's side. He suffers its frustration; He copes with its contradiction; He endures its anguish; He deals with its consequences. If He were only Creator then by His omnipotence He could recreate. If He were merely Judge then by His justice He could punish. But He is also and essentially Father and by His love He must take away the sin of the world.

If sin were a force then it could be dealt with by some counteracting and overwhelming force. But it is personal and consequently can only be effectively controlled and eliminated by a person. That is why Jesus Christ came into the world. He enters into the fullness of human experience and shares entirely in our lot.

The one sure way of changing men is by living with them. New ideas are imbibed, mental attitudes are altered, spiritual desires are kindled, and a new way of life is assured. Thus God, in Jesus Christ, by sharing His personal life with man seeks to take away his sin. But it is at a price. For man sins not merely against himself and his fellow-men but against God, who has entered so deeply into his life. The moment comes when he cries, 'Against thee, thee only, have I sinned.' Since God participates in our every experience our sins are primarily offences against Him.

The removal of sin therefore is not something that man can do for himself. However hard he tries, the amends he makes, the self-denials he endures, the oblations he offers, he cannot rid himself of his sin against God. God must do it. And this God has done. In the Cross of the Lord Jesus Christ, God has taken away the sin of the world.

Those of us who are dealing with men, their ailments, their frustrations, their breakdowns,

their worries and their remorse, know how true this is. The final truth about us all is that we stand perilously in need of having our sins taken away.

During the War a nurse was given care of a patient about whom she had been misinformed. Instead of treating him with the tenderness his condition demanded, she had been instructed to regard him as a malingerer. One night she did so and he died before her eyes. Ever since she had been haunted and tormented by a sense of her inexcusable guilt. Her life became one long effort to expiate her sin. It preyed upon her mind until she lost her nerve. Then one day she opened her heart to her minister. Acting upon the authority of the Word of God, he pronounced absolution. Almost immediately her burden rolled away.

She was a fortunate woman, for although the particulars of her experience were unique and personal, she realised—what we all need to know and appropriate to ourselves—that the Lamb of God has taken away the sin of the world.

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT

BIBLE SUNDAY

Christ's Words—Their Vitality

BY THE REVEREND ROBERT MENZIES, D.D., GLASGOW

'The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.'—Jn 6^{63}.

The commonest form of human expression is the word. It is the most natural and universal medium of thought. The word, whether uttered by the lips or written on the printed page, is the unique prerogative of man, and is one of the main points of separation between him and the animal creation. To this task of constructing words man has devoted himself with unstinted diligence. The number of words written or spoken by mortal man is almost beyond the range of computation. In this vast field how few of these words are remembered or rememberable? Most of them melt into vacuity almost as soon as they are uttered. The words of Jesus, however, stand out in striking contrast to the fugitive nature of human speech in general. They possess an inherent vital quality which plants them beyond the reach of the fleeting and transitory. 'Time doth not breathe on their fadeless bloom.' And if we ask the reason why, many are the supporting arguments we could use. Consider a few of these.

To begin with, their vitality is closely related to their *relevancy*. Words die on the speaker's lips if they are not directed to an object. Speech, if it is to be vital, must interpret some real, existing situation. The words of Jesus retain their vitality because they bear directly on human need. In the last analysis what are the fundamental needs of the human heart? One need is the assurance that the power behind the phenomenal world is one that is friendly and not hostile. Another is the conviction that the resources of that power are available for our use. Another is to know what to do with the burden of human errancy, with man's conflict with himself, with his estrangement from God and his fellow-men. There must be few people also, especially among those who are growing older, who are not troubled with the thought of death and what lies beyond. These are precisely the issues which the words of Jesus, as recorded in the Gospels, are designed to meet. As no one else can speak on these obscure themes with such authority and relevancy, what He has to say will command a respectful hearing in every generation.

Another mark of the vitality of Christ's words is their *energy and force*. Sir John Seeley describes their effect on men's minds as 'seething effervescence—broodings, resolutions, travails of heart.' Kipling described the origin of literature under the figure of a man 'afflicted with the magic of the necessary word.' He saw and described the merits of an unrecorded, heroic deed in such a way that 'his words became alive, and walked up and down in the hearts of his hearers.' It is this quality which lends to our Lord's words their value. As we read them they become alive and walk up and down in our hearts. Luther said that Christ's words had 'hands and feet.' They did something and went somewhere. They arrested and held men in their grip, and they marched on to the fulfilment of their purpose. The epithets which Jesus Himself applies to His own words are indicative of His personal awareness of their force. He said that they were like seed dropped into the soil, which worked its way successfully to a harvest, notwithstanding all the difficulties it encountered. Or to change the simile and use another favourite comparison of Christ, His words are like leaven inserted into the unkneaded dough. The vital force that is in the leaven so impregnates the substance it contacts that the whole material is transformed. Christ's words, like seed and leaven, have dynamic force, create fermentations in the mind, and set up saving reactions in the soul.

Again, the vitality of Christ's words are seen in their *survival value*. Sir Thomas Browne in his *Religio Medici* bears his testimony to the enduring quality of Scripture in these words: 'Mens Works have an age like themselves; and though they out-live their Authors, yet have they a stint and period to their duration: This only is a work

too hard for the teeth of time, and cannot perish but in the general Flames, when all things shall confess their Ashes.' What is true of the Bible generally is more markedly true of the truth which lies at the heart of it, and which is embodied in the words of Christ. Jesus Himself looked into the distant future and could foresee no time when His words would lose their relevancy. In one of the most stupendous claims ever uttered by the lips of man He said, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.' Three times over this claim is made in the Synoptic Gospels. He evidently regarded His contribution to truth as so vitally important that the day would never dawn when the human race could afford to dispense with it. His words would never pass away. Words generally come to pass away. Thousands of books issue every year from the printing press, but the average life of the average book is less than five years. Millions upon millions of words are spoken every day and every hour of the year but how many of these are remembered or treasured? Christ wrote no words. He spoke His words two thousand years ago into the listening air, but they have out-lived the passing centuries. They are still as fresh and green as when uttered on the Galilean hills. They abide as the Golden Treasury of the human race. If this is not a conclusive proof of the vitality of Christ's words one would like to know what is.

Attention should be called to another aspect of the vitality of Christ's words, namely their *personalness*. His words have this quality about them that they all sustain an organic relation to Himself. This is not necessarily true of speech in general. Some people's speech is merely an exercise of the larynx. There is no faculty engaged but the vocal organs. The speech of others is an echo caught from some one else and is in no sense personal. The speech of still others only engages the intellect or the feelings. When Jesus speaks, the fullness of His inner life is poured into His words. We not only get His ideas, we get Himself. John Morley lets us into the secret of the impressiveness of Gladstone's utterances: '*He spoke from a great depth of being.*' Deissmann states the case thus: 'The words of Jesus are not separate pearls threaded on a string, but flashes of one and the same diamond.' His words are lightning flashes scintillating from the depths of His being. When we have them, we have Himself. It is this self-disclosure in His words which gives to them their range, depth and vital quality. 'If,' said Dr. Denney, 'if, as the words of Jesus fall on our minds, we seem to hear the plunge of the lead into fathomless waters, we shall not for that imagine that we have lost our way. By these things men live, and wholly therein is the life of our spirits. We cast ourselves upon them because they outgo us and in their very immensity we are assured that God is in them.'

'*God is in them.*' That is our final guarantee that the words of Jesus will never lose their lustre nor grow obsolete with the passing years. In a very real sense we can say of all Scripture that God is in it. To a superlative degree this is true of the words of Jesus. They issue from the bosom of the Father and fall on our ears with the accent and authority of the Eternal. They are therefore saving words, words designed not simply to warn, instruct, or exhort but to reconcile men to God and save the soul in sin that lies. 'The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.' 'Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock.'

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT

God Judges our Judgments

BY THE REVEREND GEORGE W. H. LOUDON, B.D., S.T.M., UDDINGSTON

'. . . for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.'—Ro 14^{10}.

If I were asked what it is that mainly impresses me in this text I think I should say its *quietness*. There is nothing of the fortissimo about its reminder of the Great Assize. Paul does not threaten his readers with its terrors; he does not thunder about it in the fashion that was not unknown in Scots pulpits of a bygone day. He speaks of the Judgment quietly. He speaks of it as a fact of life, and a factor in the living of life. In the best possible sense of the phrase, you might say that this Judgment was something he could take for granted. These are points worth remembering when we come to estimate, or try to understand, Paul's attitude to and his use of the fact of Judgment Day.

1. Think first of all of the reason Paul has for mentioning these matters at all. Evidently there had arisen in the Church at Rome some division of opinion, some difference of judgment, over certain details of behaviour. They were not—and perhaps that point needs to be emphasized—they were not matters of first importance. But each party to the dispute had been so determined, so dogmatic, so insistent that they were right, and that therefore the others were wrong, that the whole affair had been blown up to far greater importance than it ever deserved. And in among these two groups, each fiercely proclaiming the other's wrongness, each pronouncing bitter judgments upon the other, there comes the apostle—

as it were, speaking so quietly that it is a marvel they hear him at all. 'We shall all,' he reminds them, 'stand before the judgment seat of Christ. In the light of *that* fact, isn't it possible that you are making too much of this one?' Yes—when you remember about the Judgment, it is much harder to be *small-minded*.

And that is so often our trouble; I would say, our sin. Not anything outrageous or extraordinary, but just this—that we are right and therefore he is wrong and how wrong of him it is that he should not realise it. I wonder how many friendships have come to shipwreck on this rock? I wonder how many family quarrels, that have resulted in years of estrangement, have started from something like this? I wonder how many of the splits and divisions in the Church have this behind them as a principal cause? Small-mindedness—you will not find it in any list of the Seven Deadly Sins. But you *will* find pride there, and small-mindedness is a kind of pride, and not a very pleasant kind at that. But it is harder to be small-minded when you remember the Judgment. If this fact which Paul puts so quietly before us were more part and parcel of our every-day living—as it so plainly was of his—then we might all be more tolerant, and therefore more tolerable, men and women.

2. There is, however, another feature in the situation at Rome to which Paul utters this quietest of appeals or warnings. The thing has not stopped there at mutual judgment and condemnation. It has gone beyond that, to mutual *contempt*. For some at least have been suggesting that the other party to the dispute is not merely wrong but actually *worthless*.

I suppose that one of the problems you could argue about for ever and a day is the question of the equality or inequality of men. 'All men are equal'—it sounds well but is it true? Does it mean anything or is it no more sensible than the Irishman's version of it: 'All men are equal, but some are more equal than others'? We could argue about it for ever, if we liked—and if we leave on one side the fact of the Judgment. For surely the thing that vitiates nearly all the arguments on this theme is just that they are carried on at the wrong level. We are indeed guilty of looking for equality itself on the wrong level—on too superficial a plane. It is not by matters like birth or brains or bank accounts that equality is to be assessed—not by anything so secondary. Where man's equality with other men shows first and last is here—that he is a responsible being: that he is the only one of all God's creatures who will stand before the Judgment Seat of Christ. There, at that level, you find your equality with all your fellows. It is there that you learn that the worth, or the worthlessness, of the other man is just the same as your own.

Once again, would we not all be the better for it if we could make this realization a more everyday influence in our lives? It would judge another judgment of ours that is just as false as the judgment of small-mindedness, and that is the judgment of snobbery, the judgment of contempt. It would judge it, and help to banish it. And it takes a lot of banishing, for most of us are quite unconscious of our own snobbishness. I am not thinking now of the deliberate snobbery which, while it talks to you, is always watching over your shoulder for some one more important to appear. That is obvious enough, and for that very reason is rather ridiculous. I am thinking of the snobbery that even the victim of it hardly notices—the patronising which is done so naturally that there is scarcely anything in it to resent. But after all, that is not what really matters. It is not the resentment you rouse in others that does the damage; it is the rot in your own soul. And surely we would do something to counter the spreading and extension of that rot, if we remembered more often and more regularly the fact which Paul so quietly mentions to his brethren in the Church at Rome: 'we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.'

3. Snobbery, contempt, small-mindedness—perhaps you think these strange matters to speak of when the text before us suggests so lofty and remote a speculation. But the point which I am anxious to stress and emphasize is precisely this—that it was not at all remote to the apostle; and it was not a speculation, but a fact. It belonged to precisely that level of life in which the Christian should be living; it was a fact of that life for Paul, just as it was for Jesus Himself; and I feel sure that Paul, as he dictated these words that have formed our text, had some of the great utterances of Jesus echoing in his mind. Not just the warning against the judgment that brings judgment upon him who judges, though that surely underlies the word of the apostle here; but, even more specifically, that other warning against speaking of a brother with contempt or with disdain. These are things that belong to life as we live it. They are warnings against evils in life as we know it. And they are not remote, but immediate; they are not lofty, but down-to-earth. And that is why I suggest that we take St. Paul's example for our own, and make more real in our thinking, and therefore in our behaving, the fact which he put so firmly but so quietly and courteously before some Christians of Rome who had forgotten it—and, as we sometimes say, had 'forgotten themselves' in doing so. 'We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.'

Entre Nous

A Great Preacher Looks Back

When one thinks of a famous preacher, one almost always thinks of him against the background of the denomination to which he belongs; but about Harry Emerson Fosdick there is a certain universality. There must indeed be many who have either forgotten or are unaware that Dr. Fosdick is in fact a Baptist, and who think of him as the possession of all the churches. At the age of seventy-eight he has given us his autobiography in *The Living of These Days* (S.C.M.; 25s. net).

Dr. Fosdick was fortunate in his parents. His father was a teacher, and a teacher of genius. One of his ex-pupils told Dr. Fosdick a story of him. This pupil had entered a public-speaking competition and was desperately anxious to win. He was beaten into second place, and the prize went to a rival school. He was disappointed even to tears. He goes on with the story: 'Your father guessed how I was feeling, so he followed me out of the hall, until he caught me alone before I left the building. "Son," he said, "I want to see you smile." So I forced a smile. "Son," he said, "I want to see your shoulders back." So I squared my shoulders. "Son," he said, "chin up." "There," said your father, "that's better. Now you can go home." And,' added the man, 'in all these years since, I have never been in a tight place without recalling that.' Dr. Fosdick tells how his father, on starting for school one morning, said to his mother: 'Tell Harry he can cut the grass to-day if he feels like it.' Then after a few steps he turned back and added: 'Tell Harry he had better feel like it!' Dr. Fosdick writes of his mother: 'When a man has had a mother like mine, it is useless to try to tell what he feels about her. The old saying of the Talmud that God could not be everywhere, so He made mothers, is real to me.'

Dr. Fosdick grew up with a firm belief in the conventional view of religion and of the Bible. His first questionings arose from an odd beginning. If we are at liberty to regard Hercules' feats of strength as myths and legends, why are we under duress to accept Samson's feats with complete literalness? This set him off questioning, and once and for all put an end to a rigid acceptance of conventional beliefs. When he went up to College for his Junior Year he said to his mother: 'I'll behave as though there were a God, but mentally I'm going to clear God out of the universe and start all over again to see what I can find.' One thing he never lost hold of—'the possibility of finding something to believe.' Paradoxically enough, and to the astonishment of his teachers and fellow-students alike, it was in this condition that he decided to enter the ministry. Professor Thomas asked him if it was true that he intended entering the ministry, and when the young Fosdick said yes, replied: 'Well, I have just one question to ask you. Has it ever occurred to you that a minister is supposed to be an exponent of the Christian life?'

He finished College with a brilliant record. He succeeded in getting to Union Theological Seminary to work there. In order to pay his way he shouldered an impossible burden of work, and had a complete breakdown, which was a blessing in disguise: 'I learned to pray, not because I had argued out prayer's rationality, but because I desperately needed help from a Power greater than my own. I learned that God, much more than a theological proposition, is an immediately available Resource.'

Dr. Fosdick slowly discovered the method of preaching which became so characteristically his. He learned that a sermon is not only an exposition of Scripture; still less is it a topical discourse. It is a genuine attempt to meet human need. Early in his ministry Dr. Fosdick was forced to discover the place of personal counselling. And the sermon became to him 'personal counselling on a group scale.' Every Sunday, before he preached, he prayed: 'O God, some one person here needs what I am going to say. Help me to reach him!' In this way preacher and congregation shared in the sermon. 'The sermon is not a dogmatic monologue but a co-operative dialogue.' 'A preacher's task is to create in his congregation the thing he is talking about.' 'A good sermon is an engineering operation by which a chasm is bridged so that spiritual goods on the one side—the unsearchable riches of Christ—are actually transported into personal lives upon the other.' 'A lecture is chiefly concerned with the *subject* to be elucidated; a sermon is chiefly concerned with the *object* to be achieved.' The preacher's task is to help people 'to meet trouble triumphantly, or to live above the mediocre moral level of a modern city, or to believe in God despite the world's evil, or to make Christ's principles standard in face of our disordered world.'

Dr. Fosdick has been involved in many a controversy. But at the back of everything has

been the burning desire to make Christ and Christianity real to his day and generation. He was never afraid to use new methods and new words, for he has always believed that 'astronomies change while the stars abide.' He has never been afraid to change his attitude—witness his change in regard to war and Christian pacifism. 'Any man,' said Macaulay, 'who held the same view of the French Revolution in 1789, 1804, 1814, and 1834, must either have been a divinely inspired prophet or an obstinate fool.' Yet, in spite of the fact that he has been involved in much controversy, he has never lost a certain graciousness of spirit. He quotes General Armstrong's saying with approval: 'Cantankerousness is worse than heterodoxy.' With regard to the fundamentalists who so virulently attacked him he quotes Dryden's remark about Jeremy Collier: 'I will not say, "The zeal of God's house has eaten him up"; but I am sure it has devoured some part of his good manners and civility.'

There is one tribute which Dr. Fosdick values above all. He had much to do with the troops in the 1914–18 War, and a certain Commanding Officer of a Flying Squadron reported to him that a sergeant had remarked of him: 'I don't know what religion he belongs to, but he has a hell of a lot of sense.' And that is a verdict which may well stand.

We think that we could identify Dr. Fosdick's writing even if he never signed it. In ten chapters he uses the phrase 'to be sure' twenty-two times, and the phrase 'I suspect' eight times! And where is the golf course with the *six hundred and ten* yard hole which Dr. Fosdick once did in four?

Dr. Fosdick is not seventy-eight years old; he is seventy-eight years young. This is his *latest* book; we earnestly hope that it is not his *last* book.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

The Irvine Family

Here are scintillating reflections of a childhood and girlhood as bright and fresh and cool as those ports in which it was mainly spent, Berwick-upon-Tweed and Aberdeen—*So Much Love So Little Money*, by Lyn Irvine (Faber and Faber; 13s. 6d. net).

One thinks of other books of the same class but can compare this with none of them. It fills a niche empty before. And how faithful it is to the pure, austere tradition that dominated her home; and yet with what bright, even mischievous, strokes she draws her picture. Nothing in the book is so charming nor so moving, because so true, as the portrait of her parents, so different from each other in every particular except a fundamental godliness of heart and mind.

All who knew and loved the Irvines of 'the *South*' Church must be grateful for this book, or must read it if they have not done so. A fine shelf could be filled with the Lives of the Saints of Aberdeen, and *So Much Love So Little Money* would find a very honourable place cheek by jowl perhaps with James Stark's life of Dr. James Kidd of Gilcomston, who died in 1834. For both books deal with saints who worshipped the Lord in the laughter of holiness. What an admirable mnemonic the Irvine children were given to help them to turn up the books of the New Testament.

Rum Cor Cor Gal Ephee
Phil Col Thess Thessalee
Timmy Timmy Tit Philemon
Hebrews James Pet Pet John
John John Jude Revelay-shy-on.

And how the gay and witty Irish girl (for Mrs. Irvine managed to carry her gaiety and youthful wit even through the sober alleyways of Manse life) bowed to the stern traditions of the Manse pew—near the pulpit, and at right angles to the other pews—with her demure and sober quiverful of living witnesses. 'She wore creamy pink roses on her graceful wide brimmed straws, and the milliner was always instructed to mount the roses on the left side, away from the congregation. When a new hat arrived one Saturday, too late to be returned, with all its roses on the side exposed to the congregation, my mother carefully shrouded them with a piece of black tulle.'

Remembering Lilian Irvine it is easy to understand how her daughter can write 'In my dreams heaven was a gay place . . . hell also appeared as a place for play . . . but I became aware they danced with a hot and furtive glee.' Here is the shiver which precedes the shuddering perception of maturer years when we discern that these damned souls *enjoy* their state, because we know they are at home there.

This book is packed with wit and tenderness, a justifiable pride and a strong sifting and garnering of joy out of pain.

Doch will die Lust in Ewigkeit,
In tiefe tiefe Ewigkeit.

EDITH ANNE ROBERTSON

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.